

Sho. H. Allister
Volume XVIII.] December, 1841. [Number 7.

THE

RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY:

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION, AS SET FORTH IN
THE FORMULARIES OF THE WESTMINSTER DIVINES, AND
WITNESSED FOR BY THE

ASSOCIATE SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA.

EDITED BY C. WEBSTER,

Pastor of the First Associate Congregation, Philadelphia.

VOLUME XVIII.

Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good
way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.—Is. vi. 10.

PHILADELPHIA:

PRINTED BY WILLIAM S. YOUNG,
173, RACE STREET.

1841-42.

POSTAGE: Two sheets, 100 miles, 3 cents; any greater distance, 5 cents.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
AND
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

DECEMBER, 1841.

On the Instrumentality of the Word in Regeneration, by Inquiro, with Notes, by the Editor of the Monitor.

MR. EDITOR,—I am thankful to you for the attention which you have given to my queries, and hope that you will not consider a few more remarks from me on the same subject unworthy of a place in your Monitor. The only reason which I shall assign for making them, is the importance of the subject. I have thought that there is generally a great degree of obscurity in discourses on the subject of regeneration. Perhaps this has been owing to a want of comprehension on the part of your correspondent; but though this *may* be the case, he is not as yet satisfied that it *is* the case. Some may ascribe it to the nature of the subject; to this I am by no means willing to ascribe it. It is freely admitted that the *mode of the Spirit's operation* upon the soul, is wholly incomprehensible by us; but bear in mind that this is not the point respecting which there exists any doubt in the mind of your correspondent. It is not how the Spirit operates in renewing the soul, but it is how the word operates as an instrument in this work. Now this, we contend, is a subject which from its very nature, can, and therefore should be understood by us. What is there in it that is unintelligible? We *know* from consciousness and reflection, something of the nature of the human soul, we *know* that we have an understanding, a will, and affections, we *know* how it is that truth operates upon these in all other cases, we *know* that if a proposition is presented to us, we can think upon it, we *know* that if an object is viewed as good by our understanding, the will chooses it,* we *know* too, that there is

* In natural things this is true; in spiritual things the opposite is true, in every case of sin against knowledge. We read of a servant who knew his Lord's will and did it not, Luke xii. 47. In all such cases we must suppose, either that the will refused to obey the understanding, or the conduct the will. The former is undoubtedly the truth. For it is a contradiction to say that a voluntary action is contrary to the will. Balaam had his eyes opened and saw the visions of the Almighty, the glory and blessedness of the Lord's people, yet his will did not choose to become one of them. John xv. 24, and Heb. x. 26, evidently teach the doctrine that corrupt nature sways the will against the understanding, judgment,

such a thing as a disposition, a habit of soul, naturally inclining it to choose certain objects, and reject others. Now what is the Bible? It is nothing but *truth*, truth revealed from heaven. And how is it addressed to us? Certainly, according to your own representation, as *rational* agents, as those who have understandings to think upon it, and wills to choose it. We would then ask if there be any instrumentality in the word in the regeneration of the soul, why can we not understand the nature of this instrumentality, in the production of this effect in this case, as well as in all other cases?* for there

and conscience. See also Rom. i. 21, ii. 15. Besides, if it were possible for the sinner to *choose* holiness, which it is not, (he may like Balaam choose its reward,) of what advantage could it be to him? The new-born soul is unable to obey fully the choice of the will, (Rom. xii. 15,) how much more true is it that the natural man is totally unable? Therefore the things to which the apostle here refers as evil, are to be regarded as involuntary. And this, it is apprehended, constitutes the chief difference between the sins of regenerate and unregenerate men: the latter are voluntary, the former involuntary. Consequently, it is to be unequivocally denied that we have wills to choose the truth of the Bible. We have neither taught this doctrine, nor the doctrine that we can either explain or comprehend the mode of the Spirit's operation by the instrumentality of the word in the work of regeneration.

How are we more capable of comprehending the mode in which the Spirit employs the instrumentality of the word, than the mode of the operation itself? Both are alike mysterious. Could we comprehend the one it would furnish a solution of the other. It ought not then to be asserted without proof, that "it can and should be understood by us, how the word operates as an instrument in this work." It is a mere naked assertion, an unfounded assumption. Can he inform us how the word operated in the case of Lazarus, and the man with the withered hand?

* Because other cases are *natural*; this *supernatural*. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." 1 Cor. ii. 14. I have not represented men as rational agents capable of understanding and choosing the spiritual things of the Bible, such as the regenerating work of the Spirit. I have said "there is an adaptation of nature in the soul as a spiritual, moral, and rational agent, to RECEIVE this work, when performed by the Almighty power of the Spirit, but not either to understand or choose it till the understanding is enlightened and the will renewed by the Spirit. This distinction is rendered necessary on account of the perverseness and obstinacy of some Arminians, who slander us by representing that we found the sinner's inability in his physical nature as they term it; meaning to charge us with representing God as requiring of man a *physical* impossibility. That is, to make himself a new heart, in violation of the essence of the soul and those faculties with which it is endowed by God, as the Creator. This slander is repelled by the distinction here taken.

is truth on the one hand, and rational agents to whom this truth is addressed on the other, in this as well as in all other cases. There is an individual approaching insensibly towards a dangerous precipice: go to him, and tell him that should he advance farther in the way he is going, his death will be the consequence, and he will immediately stop and turn.* Now here is an effect produced upon that individual, and what is the instrument in the production of this effect? Truth—and is there any difficulty in ascertaining the instrumentality of this truth in the production of this effect? No. And why not? Because, from the very nature of man, as a being possessed of self-love, and rational powers, there was an exact suitability in the truth to arrest him in his course. Now you have predicated the instrumentality of the word in the regeneration of the soul,

The image of God upon the soul of Adam was two-fold, natural and moral. The former consisted in the spirituality of the soul's essence, together with its mental faculties. The latter in the moral nature of the soul. The former, its spiritual essence, has never been lost, though the mental faculties have been so deranged by sin, that they are now wholly incapable of holy spiritual functions; the *thoughts* of the heart being "evil, only evil, and that continually." The latter, the moral image, has been totally defaced, destroyed by sin—"dead in trespasses and sins." Regeneration, then, is the restoration of this moral image, together with the purification and regulation of the mental faculties. Spiritual death may be more fully stated to consist in the loss of original righteousness, guilt, total depravity, spiritual blindness of mind, sensual and devilish affections. Regeneration consists in the removal of these things as to their reigning power, and eventually their entire removal, the restoration of the lost image of God, or the implantation of a new moral nature, (Pet. ii. 4,) together with all the graces of the Holy Spirit necessary to put us into the possession of the whole of the salvation procured by the mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ. This work is called a "new creature," "God's workmanship," &c., and is at an immeasurable distance from the regeneration implied by the remarks of Inquiro. For if there be any force in his reasoning it is derived wholly from the supposition that regeneration is nothing more than a change of purpose, or a new choice of the will, which is the identical regeneration of the allied forces of Arminianism, whether marshalled under Whithy, Hopkins, Taylor, or Fitch.

* This individual approaching the precipice supposes, if it have any application to the case, that the soul has the power to choose or refuse the outward call of the gospel. The very essence of Arminianism. The soul of the sinner is spiritually dead, and can put forth no holy spiritual volition till made willing in the day of Christ's power. Ps. cx. 3. Were he to call upon a dead body rolling down a precipice, it would be a nearer resemblance of the call of the word unaccompanied by the Spirit. The organs through which natural life acts are in the dead body as the faculties for spiritual life are in the soul of the sinner; but will the one or the other hear *your* call? yet the word is the instrument by which God arouses men from the profound sleep of both spiritual and natural death.

upon the *fact* that the sinner is addressed as a rational agent,* and yet you deny that this instrumentality in the least affects the passivity of the sinner. Let me ask, has the person who has been arrested in his dangerous course, been active, or passive? Did the truth that produced this change enter his soul, (to use your own illustration,) merely as the vibrations of the air upon the tympanum of the ear, or as the cannon ball in the human body? Did not his soul *before* the change was effected *think*, and consequently *act*? and was not the action of the soul after, in the order of nature, the presentation of truth to his mind? Surely you will not deny that the soul of this person was active, and you surely will not deny that the very operation of truth upon the mind, necessarily supposes activity in this case, and if in this case, then why not in all other cases? Truth is truth, and mind is mind, and if the operation of truth upon mind in one case implies activity in mind, we see not why it does not in every case. Nay, we contend that it does, and that it is unphilosophical, and absurd to suppose the contrary. It will not do for you to say, that in the one case the Holy Spirit accompanies the truth, for it is still *truth* that comes in contact with the mind. Truth, according to your theory, is still the instrument. The Spirit is only that which, like the "impulsive power" in the cannon ball, gives efficacy to the truth. Surely then, to assert that if the *word* operate, the soul must *act*, or that the doctrine of the instrumentality of the word in regeneration destroys the passivity of the soul, should not subject one to the charge of raising a "metaphysical fog." In anticipating the objections likely to be raised, against the similes adduced by you to show that there is an "adaptation of nature" in the soul to the word as an instrument of regeneration, you seem impliedly to admit that the resemblance does not hold, as the one is *natural*, and the other *moral*. You say, (after adducing the effect of thunder upon the ear, and of a cannon ball upon a body,) "should it still be said there is a natural *adaptation* in the ear, and the body of the animal, to receive the agents spoken of, which there is not in the soul to receive the word in effectual calling, we reply that the only difference is that the one is *moral*, the other *natural*; and that the comparison of natural and moral objects, must necessarily be imperfect." Now if the comparison of natural and moral objects must be imperfect, is not this the very *point* of difference, that one is natural and the other moral? Here is a difference, then, that lies in the very nature of the two objects. Matter and mind are essentially distinct; the property of the one is *vis inertiae*, the other possesses no such property. Now we should not object to comparisons, because there may be some points of dissimilarity between the two objects: according to this, there could be no such thing as comparison. But we should object to comparisons between objects, if these objects differ in their nature, and if that which is attempted to be illustrated, depends upon this *very difference* for its existence. This is the case with regard to the comparisons which you have

* By no means; but on the testimony of God's holy word. See Monitor for October, p. 226, and the scriptures there cited. With this explanation we may safely leave his long argument about the man approaching the precipice: it has no basis.

adduced: they have been taken from the material world to illustrate a *fact* respecting the mind, the existence of which, depends upon an essential difference between it and the objects which you have adduced for illustration.* This difference you have admitted, consequently, the illustration is wholly inapplicable. The point in question is, does the instrumentality of the word in the regeneration of the sinner affect his passivity? This you deny; and, to illustrate it, refer to the effect produced by the discharge of a cannon ball. Now you will perceive that this cannot, in its very nature, illustrate the point; for the object acted upon by the cannon ball *cannot* act, for it is *essentially inactive*; but is this the case with regard to the soul? Who does not know that it acts by an inherent and inalienable power?†

But we have not yet done with the cannon ball. In adducing this illustration, you represent the "impulsive power" in the ball‡ as the efficient cause of the effect, which it, as the instrumental cause, has produced. Now in this illustration, the ball no doubt was designed by you to represent the word, and the impulsive power the Spirit that gives efficiency to the word. According to this doctrine, the word will be effectual in the soul, in that very proportion in which the impulsive power of the Spirit is communicated to the word. Now, according to this explanation, regeneration consists in that change which is produced upon the sinner by the word, when brought home with power to his soul. The Spirit presents the truths of the word in such an affecting aspect to the mind, that it falls in with it. Here the change which the Spirit of God has pro-

* Inquiro is not understood here unless he means to deny that spiritual subjects are capable of being in any manner illustrated by natural objects, yet we are reluctant to believe he intends to inculcate such a sentiment. For he certainly knows that the prophets, the apostles, and our Lord himself drew illustrations of spiritual things largely from almost the entire kingdom of nature. He admits "that we should not object to comparisons, because there may be some points of dissimilarity between the two objects." True, for this reason he should not have strained our figure of the ball and the body of the animal beyond its obvious design, as appears from the context and the manner of its introduction. It was introduced to illustrate the Almighty power of the Spirit in giving efficiency to the word in regeneration, the irresistible nature of this work of the Spirit, and the entire passivity of the soul, and for nothing more. It does illustrate these points. Farther than this the figure will not hold.

† What does Inquiro mean? If he means that the soul exercises its natural faculties, about natural objects, "by an inherent, and inalienable power," it has not the remotest bearing on the subject. If he means that the soul does this about holy spiritual objects, a grosser heresy could scarcely be imagined. But we are confident he cannot mean this. What then does he mean?

‡ By no means; but in the powder. We know not how to account for these frequent mistakes. The entire efficiency is wholly in the Spirit of God:

duced, is *wholly in the word*.^{*} It is not in the mind, for the word is the instrument, like the ball rendered effective by the "impulsive power" of the Spirit. There is no change produced upon the soul, until the truth comes in contact with it, for this would be to deny the instrumentality of the word. Now, Mr. Editor, if this be not your view, then I must confess that I cannot understand the meaning of words, and the force of figures. Do not say that I have extended your figures farther than was designed by you; for I have confined myself, in their application, to the very point which you designed to illustrate,[†] and if they do not apply to this point, then they have no application to the subject. You say, "there is an adaptation of nature in the soul as a spiritual, *moral*, and *rational* agent, to receive this work. Its inability does not lie in its *essence*, but in its moral character. Guilt, depravity, stubbornness of will, and Satanic affections constitute that spiritual death from which the sinner is roused in effectual calling, by the word and Spirit of God. It is admitted, that *morally* speaking, the soul has no adaptation whatever. But it is a spirit, and therefore suitable to be acted upon by spirit, as one natural agent is suitable to be acted upon by another. It is a rational agent, and therefore its faculties are suitable to be acted upon by the word." Does not this language express the view which I have given? But lest there might be some doubt with regard to your meaning, you again say, "if any choose to call it moral suasion, then *this suasion* is an instrument in the hand of the Spirit of God, and has no more power to effect the work without the Spirit, than the rifle ball to send itself through the body of the animal without the impulsive power of powder." Now I assert that we have here the doctrine of the New Haven divines, clearly

^{*} The farther we follow Inquiro, the more our surprise is increased. He appears determined to put not only doctrines but words into our mouth which we never uttered. Where did we say any thing about the Spirit presenting "the truths of the word in such an affecting aspect to the mind that it falls in with it?" Yea, where? Yet the connexion in which this is used implies that I have at least uttered this sentiment or a similar one. Inquiro must be a little more cautious in the use of language, when writing on a subject of such gravity and importance. If permitted to go on in this style, he can prove or disprove any thing. He can palm heresy upon any man, as we shall see in the sequel he has done upon the Bible, by denying the instrumentality of the word in regeneration. Again, the change, says he, is *wholly in the word*. He would have the reader believe that this is my doctrine! Whereas, I said that it was "in the impulsive power," that is, the Spirit. See October Number, p. 225, 18th line from the top.

[†] He has, indeed, "extended" my figure; and has not "confined" it to the point for which it was adduced, as the preceding notes clearly show. Nor has he been contented with this extended view. He has dragged it in to illustrate the manner in which the Spirit employs the word, notwithstanding I intimated that we knew nothing of the manner (see p. 226, 3rd line from the top,) and by putting into my mouth the explanation of the manner of a thing which I contended is incomprehensible, he has fairly made me a New Haven divine! Admirable!

and fully expressed.* I do not believe, Mr. Editor, that you entertain their sentiments,† but I am persuaded that their sentiments are expressed in your answer to my queries.‡ To this you have been driven by the doctrine of the instrumentality of the word in regeneration.§ And this only shows that there were some grounds for my fears|| that orthodox divines give countenance to this doctrine of moral suasion, by the manner in which they express themselves, on the instrumentality of the word in regeneration. But I have made an assertion, and of course it devolves upon me to establish its truth.¶ This I shall endeavour to do. Let us then inquire, what is the doctrine of these divines? Do they maintain that the Spirit is not the efficient cause of regeneration? No. You will not find a denial of this in all their writings. It is true that there are some who maintain that the Spirit is the author only as He has revealed the holy scriptures,** by which this work is effected, but there are few who go this length. Taylor, and Fitch, assert the operation of the Spirit in regeneration, and what is the nature of this operation? It is just such, if I am not mistaken, as that which is described in your answers to my queries.†† If any one reads the writers in the Christian Spectator, he will easily see the truth of this statement.

* It may surprise the reader who has not yet read my article, here commented upon, to learn that in it I explicitly DENY that moral suasion can effect the great change produced in regeneration! When the apostle Paul would assert his apostleship in the strongest possible manner, he asks, "Am I not an apostle?" Adopting the same mode of expression, I ask, "Is 'a new birth,' 'a new creation,' a resurrection from the dead, to be effected by moral suasion?" Could a stronger negative have been used? And this interrogation immediately precedes the words quoted by Inquiro! See p. 225, near the bottom. These words were added as an expression of my disapprobation of those who make moral suasion the instrument. That is, "if any choose," we did not choose to do this, for we had just unequivocally condemned those who do so, "to call it" (the instrumentality of the word) "moral suasion," it can avail them nothing; for this suasion has no more power to effect the work without the Spirit, than the ball to send itself through the body of the animal without the impulsive power of powder." Inquiro will excuse us if we have no ambition to accept his new *cognomen*,—New Haven divine—when holding such language as the above. For we can assure him we have as little relish for it as some men have for the D. D.

† This is kind.

‡ It is to be regretted that he should labour under such an erroneous persuasion.

§ The doctrines of the Bible never drive men into error.

|| In his own brain.

¶ If he means that Arminians and New Haven divines maintain the doctrine of *moral suasion* it needs no proof. If he means that my language implies such views, this has been already disproved.

** Is not this a denial that the Spirit is the efficient cause of regeneration?

†† You are mistaken.

Similes such as you have employed,* are made use of to show that it is truth, under the illuminating influence of the Spirit of God, that regenerates the soul; that all that is necessary, is, for the Spirit to press this truth upon the mind of the sinner, and the effect will be produced.† Among the advocates of this doctrine, there is a diversity of sentiment. Some hold to the self-determining power of the will. Others deny this, and say that the will is subject to the influence of motives; but both, however, agree in this one point, that regeneration is a change effected through the instrumentality of truth, in the hand of the Spirit.‡ The former of these sentiments is maintained by the New Haven divines, and indeed, to a greater or less degree, by all Arminians. The latter sentiment has occasionally its advocates. While the former ascribe regeneration to the influence of truth, brought home upon the mind by the Spirit of God, they deny that the Spirit in any way subjects the will to this truth, which is thus brought to bear upon it, but that the will may still refuse the good which is thus set before the mind by the Spirit of God. They do not, indeed, say that the truth has no influence upon the will, but they deny that it has not an *irresistible* influence. Whitby has been called the Prince of Arminians, and what is his statement on this point? We shall quote his own language, "To say that the greatest good proposed, the greatest evil threatened, when equally believed and reflected on, is not sufficient to engage the will to choose the good and refuse the evil, is in effect to say, that which alone doth move the will to choose or to refuse, is not sufficient to engage it so to do; which, being contradictory to itself, must of necessity be false. Be it then so that we naturally have an aversion to the truths proposed in the gospel; *that* only can make us indisposed to attend to them, but cannot hinder our conviction when we do apprehend them and attend to them. Be it that there is in us also a

* Not so: he has adduced no similes from their writings such as I employed; nor can he do so. And even where there is a remote resemblance between their similes and mine, the application is wholly different. Mine are applied to the essential faculties of the soul, theirs to the moral nature, or rather the *will*. In general they are *restricted* to the will.

† Does not Inquiro perceive that regeneration in the mouth of New Haven divines means one thing, and quite another in the mouth of a Calvinist? With the former, it is confined to the *will*, with the latter it is a change of moral *nature*, and the renewal of the will as consequent upon that change. Their regeneration is not the regeneration taught in the scriptures. They make the *will* every thing in the soul; they have excluded from their system the declaration of our Lord, "No man can come to me except my Father, who sent me, draw him." Whatever may be the shades of difference among them, they all make shipwreck of faith upon this rock.

‡ In this they are right. And we should not be afraid of a Bible doctrine because Arminians hold it. Had they *no* truth among them, it would be deplorable. Their error lies not in their view of instrumentality; but in their view of its efficiency, the nature of regeneration itself, and the nature of the Spirit's work in effecting this change.

renitenency to the good we are to choose; *that* only can indispose us to believe it is, and to approve it as our chiefest good. Be it that we are prone to the evil that we should decline; *THAT* only can render it the more difficult for us to believe it is the worst of evils. But yet what we do really believe to be our chiefest good, will still be chosen; and what we apprehend to be the worst of evils, will, whilst we do continue under that conviction, be refused by us. It therefore, can be only requisite, in order to these ends, that the good Spirit should so *illumine our understandings*, that we, *attending to and considering* what lies before us, should apprehend and be convinced of our duty;* and that the blessings of the gospel should be so propounded to us, as that we may discern them to be our chiefest good; and the miseries it threateneth, so as we may be convinced that they are the worst of evils; that we may choose the one, and refuse the other." Now this is precisely the sentiment of the New Haven divines. They admit the influence of motives, but assert the competency of the will to resist this influence. The others of whom we have spoken, represent the will to be entirely under the control of motives. Both, however, agree in this one point, that there is a *constitutional susceptibility* in the mind, to be acted upon by the motives which the Spirit of God presents. The latter sentiment we believe is nearer the truth than the former; for it does not appear to involve in it a denial of the doctrines of election, perseverance, &c.; but there is involved in both, the denial of the doctrine of *Total Depravity*. Now this, we conceive, Mr. Editor, is precisely the sentiment of the New School men. Do they not assert the natural ability of the sinner to believe and obey God? Now what do they mean when they make this assertion? Do they mean merely that man has a soul, and that this soul is possessed of an understanding, will, and affections? No; for who ever denied this? Do they mean that man is a rational, and therefore a moral agent? No; for who ever denied this? What then do they mean by the doctrine of natural ability? Is it not a *constitutional susceptibility* in the mind, to be influenced by motives which the word of God presents, and do they not maintain that all that the Spirit of God does in regeneration, is to bring these motives to bear upon the mind?† Compare this sentiment with that which is expressed in your answer. "There is an adaptation of nature, &c."‡ Will the New School men contend for

* Arminian regeneration, then, is simply illumination and conviction of duty. Just such Christians as Balaam and other similar characters spoken of in the scriptures. Nay, more, Judas had this regeneration. He knew that our Lord was innocent and that it was his *duty to defend*, not *betray* him. This is implied in his confession after the deed.

† Our correspondent evidently understands *New School* divinity. Did he understand the *Old* as well, we think he would hardly have denied the instrumentality of the word in regeneration.

‡ It must be confessed that our correspondent labours with becoming zeal to convict us; or, at least, our language with Arminianism. Had he laboured with half the zeal to maintain his darling *error*, that the Spirit operates without any instrumentality, who can say that he might not have produced conviction, at least on some minds? But his exertions on the former point will probably cause a failure in both. Does he not

more than this? Will Barnes? Will Beecher? We think not. They will tell you that the sinner is *morally* unable to believe, and that this inability can only be removed by the Spirit of God. But ask how this is effected; and they will tell you solely by the influence of motives. Let any one read the trial of these two men, and they will easily discover this. And what is the fundamental argument which they use to maintain the natural ability of the sinner? Is it not his moral agency?* Do they not contend that this necessarily supposes a natural ability? Now, to such a doctrine as this, we are entirely opposed; and we doubt not but this is the case with yourself. We believe that there is no *adaptation of nature* on the

know there is a very important difference between *adaptation* and *susceptibility*. The former denotes "the state of being suitable," "fitness." The latter denotes, "the quality of admitting or receiving either something additional, or some change, AFFECTION or PASSION." A Calvinist uses the word *adaptation* in reference to the physical or essential faculties of the soul. The Arminians, and New Haven divines use the word *susceptibility* in reference to moral qualities. A very great, nay, radical difference here, Inquiro, to the contrary notwithstanding. Confounding, or overlooking this difference, is perhaps his greatest error. There is an *adaptation* in a clock run down to keep time, but no *ability*, no *susceptibility*; so there is a physical adaptation in the soul to be acted upon by the word, but no ability, no susceptibility. It is hoped this figure will not be extended beyond the designed use of it, in this place. There is a *susceptibility* in the soul to imitate others in natural things, together with corresponding ability; but not in spiritual things. Now take the figure of the clock; it is wholly dependent, notwithstanding its adaptation, upon the application of some power external to itself for its motion. It is adapted to receive this external power in a passive way. The soul of the sinner, however, while as helpless in regard to spiritual life as the clock run down is in regard to motion, adds also a moral repugnance to the work of regeneration, which, however, does not destroy this adaptation. It has an adaptation in its physical powers, but no natural ability, and adds a moral nature directly the reverse of the Spirit's work. What then becomes of the New Haven susceptibility, or *natural* ability. It is a *fancy*, a *dream*; and even if it had existence, as they contend, *cui bono*? Of what use can natural ability be for the performance of a supernatural work? The New Haven "susceptibility," doctrine of "motives," and "competency of the will," &c., have no place in our theology, nor in any language used by us at any time. With the foregoing remarks the flourish about Barnes and Beecher may be passed without comment.

* Does Inquiro deny the moral agency of the sinner? Agency and ability are not synonymous terms in spiritual things. Or does he admit the force of the New Haven argument that moral agency necessarily infers ability? He should have explained here. Moral agency is necessary to moral accountability, and the existence of moral government. Here lies one of the fundamental errors of New Haven divinity. It is indeed true, that the moral agency of the sinner is exerted against the

part of the soul, to the operation of the word.* What do those illustrations which you have adduced, import? Do they not import that the action of the Spirit is on the *truth*?† Certainly they do. The very idea of instrumentality implies this, and your very language on this point implies it. Is not the efficiency of the Spirit compared to the "impulsive power" in the cannon ball? Increase this power, and the velocity of the ball is increased; so increase the influence of the Spirit, and the word comes with greater force to the mind. It is presented, to use the language of the New Haven men,‡ in a *more affecting aspect*, and consequently a greater effect is produced. Now to this language we object not, if used figuratively, for the influence of the word upon the regenerated soul, for it is scriptural; but we totally object to it, when used as explanatory of the instrumentality of the word in regeneration.§ It does not, for

Spirit's work, but the thing itself exists; and because God created man a proper subject of moral government, and gave him law, and still holds him responsible, notwithstanding his fall, our New Haven divines, as well as Arminians, hold his ability to do all that is required by the law. Thus they rush into the absurdity that rebellion abolishes the claims of law. Or that it would be inconsistent with divine goodness to extend over the rebel that law which was suitable to a state of innocence; as though the claims of law must yield to the sin of man. Moral agency and moral accountability are immutable. The *ability* of man is mutable. This ability has been lost. Its loss, however, did not and could not rob God of his right to obedience: "I am the Lord, I change not." We think the church has a right to know whether Inquiro denies the moral agency of the sinner.

* There is a *physical* adaptation, but not a moral; neither is there any natural *ability*.

† Not exclusively, nor even principally. This is evidently a distorted view to make out a case. For who does not know that the power is always directed to, and terminates upon the object designed to be affected, whatever may be the instrumentality; otherwise the effect would terminate on the instrument and the object remain unaffected. This is more strikingly true in spiritual than natural things. Men use instruments from necessity, God in sovereignty. With him the instrument is as nothing, and seems to be used in adaptation to our weakness and for our greater good.

‡ We entreat you not to put it into our mouth. For it nauseates. It is alike repugnant to our moral principles and moral feelings.

§ So do we "totally object to it," not only "when used as explanatory of the instrumentality of the word in regeneration," but also, when "used for the influence of the word upon the regenerated soul." It is as inapplicable and unscriptural in the one case as in the other. For the work of the Spirit, as an indwelling and sanctifying Spirit, is as inscrutable to us as his regenerating work. The nature of his work is the same in both cases, and can only differ in degree. A new moral nature, a new spiritual life, are created in the soul, kept there by his inhabitation, nourished, caused to grow and spring up into eternal life. And all this is

it cannot explain it. The one is natural, the other is moral. When you wish an instrument to produce an extraordinary effect, you repair and improve it, and thus you calculate upon the effect; so, according to these illustrations, the Spirit of God, when He designs to convert a soul, acts so upon the truth, that this conversion follows as a necessary consequence. Now we would like to know how the Spirit can act upon the truth, without acting in the first place, *directly and immediately* upon the mind, and thus qualifying it for the reception of the truth;* but when this is done, a great and supernatural *change* is effected, prior to the operation of the word.† This

effected by the instrumentality of the word. But the *manner* who shall declare? God's works of providence are in the sea, his path in the great waters, and his footsteps are not known. Who then shall describe his works of grace, the hidden and glorious actings of his Spirit upon the souls of the redeemed? The most that we can do is to confine ourselves to the words of the Spirit himself. And in reference to the whole of this work, it is called giving life, begetting, a new-birth, a new creature, revealing the things of Christ, writing the law on the heart, pouring him out upon us, shining into the heart with a divine light, opening the eyes, opening the heart, &c. Not a word of the *manner*. But the New Haven language adopted by Inquiro is nothing but the moral suasion of the Spirit. Nothing but rotten Arminianism in every sense of the words. Sanctification is as much the work of the Spirit as regeneration. He *works* in us. And in all he is sovereign. Did the Spirit present the word in a *more affecting aspect* to John than to Peter, that prevented the fall of the former? Or did he permit Peter to meet with a greater temptation than John, withholding at the same time a sufficient measure of the Spirit to enable him to abide the trial, that he might be humbled on account of his forwardness and impetuosity? If there was any difference between these apostles in this respect, the word would appear the more *affecting* to Peter on account of his more ardent natural temperament. And yet he was the less perfect character of the two. Therefore it was not Peter's *susceptibility* even after his regeneration, but the intercession of our Lord, together with a corresponding work of the Spirit, by the word, that prevented Satan from sifting him like wheat. So much for New Haven "*constitutional susceptibility*," and "*affecting aspect*" of the word. These things are the *dreams* of vain and carnal souls.

* The action is not *upon* the word, but *by* the word, and *upon* the soul. Does Inquiro deny the power of the Spirit to act upon the soul by instrumentality? If not, we see no force in his reasoning.

† We regret that Inquiro should be led to a direct, unequivocal contradiction of the Scriptures. James i. 18; "Of his own will begat he us, *with the word of truth*." 1 Pet i. 23; "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, *by the word of God*." Hence, regeneration is elsewhere expressed by *implanting* and *writing* the truth in the soul: "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts." Jer. xxxi. 33. The operation of the *soul* upon the word

is what we understand by regeneration, in which the sinner is *wholly passive*; and if this be not regeneration, then we contend that the sinner is active in his regeneration.* We might dwell much longer on this interesting and important subject. We might show the consequences which naturally follow, from the doctrine maintained in the answer; but we have already extended our remarks much farther than we had intended. Our only object in making these remarks is to elicit discussion on this subject. We hope, Mr. Editor, that you will excuse any degree of harshness that may be found in the language of your correspondent. The sentiments which he has ascribed to you, are not such as he believes to be entertained by you, but such as he believes the language employed by you expresses. And he accounts for this language by the difficulty, shall I not say the impossibility? of reconciling the efficiency of the Spirit, with the instrumentality of the word in regeneration, and the instrumentality of the word in regeneration with the passivity of the sinner. Permit me, before I conclude, to notice a remark of yours in your answer. You say, "How the querist can be satisfied that the sinner is ordinarily called, when attending upon the means, and yet doubt respecting the instrumentality of the word, is not easily perceived." When our Saviour performed miracles on earth, he made use of what might be called means. Now you will not assert that there was any instrumentality in these means, any adaptation in them to the effects produced. It is our duty to use the means, and why? Because there is an adaptation in them to regenerate us?† No. But for the very same reason that it was the duty of Naaman the Syrian, to wash in the river Jordan, at the appointment and command of Jehovah.‡ Again, while we would deny that there is any aptitude in the word to produce the change that is effected in regeneration, yet we admit that there is a suitableness in the word to the operations of the regenerated soul. It is upon this word that the soul

is indeed subsequent to the work of regeneration, but the effectual operation of the word upon the soul in the hand of the Spirit is regeneration.

* If this mean any thing, it is this, that God cannot act by instrumentality without making the object acted upon active. We have always been taught to believe that God can act with or without, above, or contrary to means, without affecting in any degree the *passivity* of the object on which his action terminates.

† I have no where said there is an adaptation in the word to regenerate us. Nor do I believe such a doctrine. There is a fitness between the physical faculties of the soul and the word, which renders it a suitable instrument to be employed by the Spirit in this work. And there is an exact correspondence between the *testimony* of the Spirit in the word, and the *work* of the Spirit upon the soul by the word.

‡ Did the Assyrian receive the blessing *prior* to the use of the appointed means? Why then attempt to maintain that regeneration is effected *prior* to the operation of the word? This example, like many others in the Scriptures, completely overthrows the whole system of *In-qui-ro*. Nay more; we challenge him to produce a single example from the Bible, which gives countenance to the doctrine that the effect is produced without or *prior* to the use of the means.

lives. It is the sincere milk by which the new-born infant grows. Now the soul of the adult is no sooner made alive by the power of God, than it performs spiritual acts, such as faith, love, and hope. It is the word upon which it acts. There is then, you will observe, a necessity for an acquaintance with the word, as without it the regenerated soul could not exercise that life which God has given it. Lazarus would not have been raised from the dead, had there been no air for him to breathe.*

INQUIRO.

* It is indeed the word upon which the new-born soul acts, and feeds, and grows; but the word was made to act first upon the soul, in which action the soul was wholly *passive*. The word is not properly the air in which the new-born soul lives, but the food upon which it subsists.

Thus we have patiently, but we fear not very profitably to our readers, followed Inquiro through his long essay. This we were obliged to do, or let it pass altogether, on account of its peculiar structure, its ingenuity, its mixture of truth and error, of plausibility and sophistry, of unfounded distinctions and omissions of those which are important and necessary. And we think if he was not chargeable with raising a "metaphysical fog" in his first essay, he has this time raised a metaphysical *dust* which can have no good tendency on the eyes of the unlearned.

We shall now conclude with an expression of regret, that such an article has been written by a minister of the Associate Church, for the following reasons:

1. Because his denial of the instrumentality of the word in regeneration contradicts, as we have already seen, the testimony of the scriptures, and, as we shall now see, the subordinate standards of our church. Confession of Faith, Chap. X. Sec. 1; Larger Cat. Quest. 67; Testimony, Article xvii. *Of the Work of the Holy Spirit*. Section 4.

2. Because, instead of disproving the instrumentality of the word in regeneration, which we had asserted, and *that* was the only point at which our former article aimed, he has laboured to convict us of New Haven divinity; and instead of proving that the Spirit regenerates the soul (of the adult) without instrumentality, he deals only in assertions which are indeed sufficiently unequivocal and abundant. But he has neither given nor attempted to give the shadow of proof. Had he fairly succeeded in convicting us of New Havenism, it would neither have proved his position nor disproved ours.

3. Because he confounds or denies the necessary distinction between the physical faculties of the soul and their moral character and state, and labours to attach our words, written in reference to the former, to the latter point; on this is built the great body of his essay. But by neglecting or denying this distinction, he has given countenance to the slander of our opponents, that we represent God as requiring of the sinner a physical impossibility; to do that which is contrary to the faculties God gave him in his creation; for this would be true if we should deny the adaptation of the faculties of the soul to *receive* the instrumentality of the word.

4. Because he exalts too much the moral power of the new-born soul.

It does, indeed, put forth the exercise of holy spiritual graces; but never without the aid of the Spirit. For although the soul is now active, it is still influenced by the Spirit, and altogether dependent on the work of the Spirit. In regeneration the Spirit *implants* gracious principles. In *sanctification*, which may be termed progressive regeneration, he enables the believer to exercise those principles. "It is God that worketh in you both to *will* and to *do*." And in both these cases the word is the instrument. "Thy word hath QUICKENED me." "I will never forget thy precepts, for WITH them thou hast QUICKENED me." "The law of the Lord is perfect, CONVERTING the soul."

5. Because he depreciates the word, and furnishes the people with an excuse for their neglect of means. If the word be not the instrument of regeneration, then we may close our church doors, abolish the ministry, and cease all efforts to send the gospel to the heathen. Sinners may take full license in their neglect and contempt of divine institutions, till they are born again. It is wrong for ministers to entreat and persuade them to be diligent in the use of means, looking to God for the blessing. Why should we tell them it is as fatal on the one hand to neglect the means, as it is on the other to trust in them? It will not help the difficulty to say that God has commanded sinners to use the means. For what God has commanded to be done that is an instrument in the hand of the Spirit of our salvation. Inquiro's theory, then, removes the corner stone of the whole system of means. On his theory we cannot comprehend the apostle when he declares, "It hath *pleased* God, by the foolishness of preaching, to *SAVE* them that believe." Salvation certainly includes regeneration.

6. Because he separates what God hath joined. Is it consistent with analogy, nay, with Divine Wisdom, that God should regenerate without means, and then employ means to sanctify? For the means in themselves are as inefficacious in the one case as in the other.

7. Because he gives countenance to the Arminian slander, that according to the Calvinistic theory, we can be under no obligation to use means. "If we are of the elect we shall be saved, if not, we shall be damned, do what we will." If we are regenerated without means, there would be some force in this slander; for regeneration is begun salvation, and effectually secures its consummation. But we do not yield this advantage to the Arminians. We tell them that salvation is communicated in the use of the means; that God has connected the means with the end by a divine constitution, that a diligent attention to means is a mark of grace, and that it is presumption in any to expect salvation in the neglect of means.

"We conclude with two authorities of high repute—"This, [the word of God] is the ordinary *instrument* which God employs in the regeneration of the adult."—DR. OWEN.

"Is it not natural to love the *means* by which even my very nature itself hath been communicated to me, and by which I am what I am? It is violence to the new nature of the children of God to withhold from them the word of the gospel, which hath been instrumental to their new birth."—HOWE.

The Divisions and Present State of the Associate Church.

LETTER I.

To the members and friends of the Associate Presbyterian Church of North America.

DEAR BRETHREN:—In addressing you as “members and friends of the Associate Presbyterian Church of North America,” I take it for granted that you are the friends of that doctrine, order, government, and discipline for which it has been the peculiar profession of our church to witness in all her standards, ever since she had a distinctive existence. I take it also for granted that you wish to see this profession maintained, and consistently carried out in practice; and that you do so because you believe the doctrine, order, government, and discipline professed by our church to be founded on, taught and required by the word of the great God of heaven and earth.

It is a pleasure, brethren, when differences of opinion, or matters of controversy arise, that in every thing which pertains to our religious profession and practice, we have such a standard as the Bible, to which to refer, an unerring standard “made plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth.” All who are members of the Associate Church, profess to have compared the subordinate standards of the Associate Church, with the supreme standard, the word of God, and to be satisfied that they agree. And upon this profession we have pledged ourselves to one another, according to God’s word, “to strive together for the faith of the gospel.” We have professed to believe that unity in the faith of the gospel and the practice of Christian duties, are required by the word of God, and that schisms and divisions in the church of Christ are sinful: hence we are commanded to mark and avoid those who cause divisions and offences in the church, because “such serve not the Lord Jesus, but their own belly.” Rom. xvi. 17, 18.

But notwithstanding the clearness and pointedness with which divisions in the church are condemned in the word of God, they seem to be viewed by many in our day as light matters, or rather to be fostered and cherished than suppressed. The most of you, brethren, remember that even the peaceful Friends, (Quakers) not long since split into two divisions. The Methodists also, and the General Assembly Presbyterians.

But without detaining to enumerate the different divisions that have recently sprung up in this land among Baptists, Episcopalians, Dutch Reformed, Reformed Presbyterians and others, we may turn our attention to those more immediately connected with our own ecclesiastical association. Every intelligent member of the Associate Church is acquainted with the divisions and separations that have affected the peace and prosperity of our church since her first planting in this land, in 1754. In order to accomplish the organization since known as the Associate Reformed Synod, in this country, a division or schism had to be made in two religious societies, viz: The Associate Presbytery of Pa., and the Reformed Presbyterians, and then, as a necessary consequence, a separation had to be made from the General Associate Synod in Scotland. Thus to produce one new organization, three divisions and separations were effected. That organization composed at first of persons differing

widely in sentiment on some points of doctrine, it could not be expected that the body would long remain an integer. And the result proved the correctness of the opinion. That society soon separated, and part was merged into the General Assembly Presbyterian Church, and the remnant is now to be found in three separate Synods differing in practice and sentiment, and without any regular bond of ecclesiastical fellowship. Thus one unlawful division or schism generally prepares for, and leads to others.

From these facts it must be evident to every attentive observer of the condition of the church in this as well as in other countries, that division and disorganization is the order of the day. That state of things foreseen and predicted by the prophetic psalmist, Ps. lxxiv. 1—9, is literally to be seen in the present state of the visible church. "The enemies of God, (for all are God's enemies, who are haters of his truths, of the doctrines of his holy word, of the order, government, and discipline which he has appointed for his church) the enemies of God roar in the midst of his congregations, they set up their ensigns for signs. The time was that a man was famous according as he lifted up axes upon the thick trees, as builder of the house of God; but now the order is reversed, they break down the carved work thereof with axes and hammers. They have cast fire into the sanctuary of God, and defiled it by casting down the dwelling place of his name unto the ground."

The same spirit which has produced these afflictive and disastrous results in other denominations, has long been at work in our own. All of you, dear brethren, who have taken any interest in the peace or prosperity of our Zion, already know that within a few years past Dr. A. Bullions of Cambridge, Messrs. Duncan Stalker of North Argyle, Andrew Stark, and H. H. Blair, of New York, all of the State of New York, have been regularly deposed from the office of the ministry, and Messrs. T. Goodwillie, and W. Pringle of Vermont, have been suspended by the ecclesiastical courts of the Associate Presbyterian Church of North America, to which they were amenable. It is no doubt known to the most of you, that since the meeting of the Associate Synod in May and June last, these individuals, one being absent, with some of their adherents, met and pretended to constitute themselves into an ecclesiastical body, and to assume the name, style, and designation of the Associate Synod of North America. And have thus pretended and attempted not merely to depose all the ministers and other members of the Associate Synod, but to unchurch and annihilate the whole Associate Church of North America.

Some six or seven individuals who had themselves been for some time cast out of the communion of the church, and deposed from office, either on account of conduct deemed immoral by the laws and universally received principles of all civilized society, or for palpable violation of solemn vows voluntarily assumed, pretended at one stroke, by a power wholly self-assumed, and contrary to the plain dictates of the word of God, to strike out of ecclesiastical existence nearly one hundred ministers of the gospel, and more than twenty thousand professing Christians. By most sober thinking people at least, this will be regarded as a high-handed assumption; and those who have taken such a step should be able to produce clear evidence

that their cause is just, and should be ready to bring it to the severest ordeal. I would by no means say that the justness of a cause is to be judged by the number, whether many or few, of those who espouse it; but it may be pretty safely inferred that those, though few, who believe they have a good cause, do not fear to submit it to the most rigid investigation. We may then conclude that neither these individuals, nor their friends, if they believe their cause to be good, should take offence at an attempt to investigate their high pretensions. For either they, or the Associate Synod of North America which excluded them from her communion, are very greatly in the wrong. The position assumed by these individuals admits of no moderate or middle course. The one or the other must be guilty of daring rebellion against Jesus Christ, who has instituted in his church the ordinance of government, and appointed certain courts which he has invested with authority to try offenders, to justify the innocent, to censure, and even to excommunicate from the society of the faithful the impenitent offender, and to restore the humble penitent, whatever his offence may have been.

The Associate Synod which held its sessions as a court of Christ's visible kingdom, in the borough of Washington, Pa., in the months of May and June last, and which body has had a regular, continued, and acknowledged ecclesiastical existence in this country since the year 1754, (eighty-seven years,) has either ceased to be what she professes to be, an ecclesiastical body, and a part of the church of Christ, or those individuals who some time in June last met in the brick meeting house belonging to the Associate congregation of Cambridge in the state of New York, are not what they now profess to be, "The Associate Synod of North America." These individuals pretend that the body or society which they themselves acknowledge as an authorized court of Christ up to that time, and which had existed and exercised authority as a court of Christ for nearly a century in this country, then ceased to exist as such: And that the ecclesiastical authority with which the Synod had heretofore been invested, was now transferred to those who met in the brick meeting house in Cambridge. If this is truly the case, as it is pretended, the transfer of the authority, and the right to exercise it, must have been made by Him, who is the only Head and King of his church, from whom all government and right to rule in it must be derived. This question then, on account of its intrinsic importance, is worthy of a serious and candid investigation.

If the position assumed by the Cambridge meeting, viz: that they are now and henceforth the only Associate Synod of North America, and that all the authority, jurisdiction, and divine right of the Associate Synod of North America is now vested in them by the King and Head of the Church, it is certainly worth while to inquire very carefully, when and how this transfer was made? With what act of the former body did the ecclesiastical authority cease? What are the evidences of the transfer having been made by Christ to the new body? For it is admitted that a body or society of professing Christians may so far fall away from the truth in profession and practice, as to forfeit the authority and privileges with which Christ invests his true church, as well as an individual may forfeit his office and privileges in the church of Christ. But in such cases

there must be some overt act, or acts committed. These acts must be declared inconsistent with the character of the church of Christ, or the Christian state, by some plain rule of holy scripture. An error of judgment would not be sufficient of itself, nor even a succession of erroneous acts of judgment may not, because infallibility is not promised to church courts nor church officers.

The subject is worthy of investigation in a practical point of view. We are commanded by the word of God, "To mark them which cause divisions and offences in the church, and to avoid them." Rom. xvi. 17. We ought then to know who are the offenders, and who are to be marked. For if we follow other men in a divisive and sinful course, and thus bid them God speed, we make ourselves partakers of their sin, 2 John 8—11.

Now there are some things which appear very singular in this case; for at the last meeting of the Associate Synod, and within a few days of the meeting in Cambridge, the same individuals who composed that meeting, some of them personally, and the rest by memorial, appeared before the Associate Synod of North America in session as judicially met, in Washington, Pa., petitioning for certain things, which that body could grant only on the supposition that it was a true court of Christ's house. These same persons and some of their adherents had been asking the same or similar things on every opportunity from the time they had fallen under the censure of the church.

The Synod judged they could not, consistently with faithfulness and duty, according to the word of God, restore to fellowship in the church men found guilty of offences against morality and religion, while no penitence or sorrow was professed.

Another singular circumstance in the case of these individuals is, the constant effort of the principal offenders to evade a trial. Indeed the present difficulty between these men and the church courts, if reduced to a single point, would be found to consist in this, viz: Shall some persons be allowed to remain in the fellowship and enjoy full communion in the Associate Church without being subject to the discipline and government of the church? The church is for holding all her members amenable to her government and discipline, but these men insist that they shall be exempted. They seem disposed to hold others amenable. When Mr. Webster belonged to the Albany Presbytery, he was on trial for certain things considered offensive in a pamphlet published by him: both Mr. Stark and Mr. P. Bullions took an active part on his trial: the latter drew up the *libel*. But when they themselves were charged with flagrant violations of the laws of morality and religion, their whole effort was to evade a trial altogether. Mr. Stark absented himself as long as he could according to the rules of ecclesiastical courts: when he could no longer evade an investigation by his absence he declined the authority of the court, and accordingly never met the charges. The same course has been pursued by Dr. Alexander Bullions and others. But to this point I intend to advert more particularly afterwards.

These men have with equal pertinacity shunned all discussion of any of the questions at issue between them and the church courts, where people could have an opportunity of seeing the facts on both sides presented. Without mentioning more instances of the kind,

Dr. P. Bullions, the editor of the periodical which they have styled the "Associate Presbyterian Magazine," declined an invitation recently given him or any of his associates, through the press (see appendix to Mr. Martin's sermon, p. 157,) to discuss in the pages of that periodical all the matters in controversy, taking up each charge separately, with the decisions made thereon, and examining them all by the principles of protestantism, the rules of presbyterianism and the dictates of the word of God. Mr. T. Goodwillie of Barnet, Vermont, who had addressed his congregation at large on these matters, and given representations of transactions of which none of his people had an opportunity of judging for themselves, declined when he was earnestly entreated by several of the elders and most respectable and serious men of that congregation to meet with and discuss before the congregation, the points on which he had charged the Synod and Presbyteries with acting erroneously. This he did when he had the opportunity of availing himself of the assistance of two of his associates. Surely, if these men had confidence in the righteousness of their cause, they need not fear and ought not to shun any fair investigation to which it could be subjected. Many well meaning people, no doubt, believe that these men are not out of the way of duty in the course which they are pursuing in attempting to divide the church. As I am, however, fully persuaded that the church courts had full and sufficient evidence to warrant them in coming to the conclusions to which they did on the cases before them, so I believe that if their origin, and all the facts connected with these matters were fully before the religious community, there would not be found one honest man or woman in the whole length and breadth of the land, of ordinary capacity to approve or justify the course of these men.

It can be shown, I think, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the present course which these individuals have adopted, and are pursuing, is the result of a system or plan either to change the character of the Associate Church in this country as a distinct witnessing body for the truth of Jesus Christ, or to destroy the influence of her testimony; that is, if the character of the church could not be changed, that she should be divided; though it is probable that at first nothing more was intended by some than to bring the Associate Church in America into conformity with the United Secession in Scotland. This plan was proposed to myself nearly twenty years ago, by an individual whom I have no reason to doubt was in the confidence of those who were aiming at this object.

I would gladly have permitted the knowledge of all these things to perish in forgetfulness, if the truth and purity of Christ's ordinances and the integrity of his body the church were not suffering. It is indeed with much reluctance that I permit myself to be drawn from more congenial and much more pleasant studies to devote the time to this subject necessary to set it clearly before the community. In the accomplishing of my task, I will have to mention the names and animadvert on the conduct of several individuals without their consent. But I shall endeavour to introduce nothing which I do not consider relevant, and whatever I find necessary to notice I will do it, fully aware of the responsibility which I assume, and will be ready to meet it. I subscribe myself, dear brethren, yours in the truth.

JAMES P. MILLER.

Pastor of the Associate Congregation of Argyle, N. Y.

General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.

The Assembly met again at half-past three, when four propositions (given below) of the new code of discipline, agreed to by the joint committees, were taken into consideration.

The following three propositions were passed without opposition:

1. That a profession of belief conformable to the Westminster Confession be made by all persons, previously to baptism or communion.
2. That erroneous and immoral persons be debarred from the sealing ordinances.
3. That communicants must previously receive tokens to be distributed by the minister and elders conjointly.

The fourth proposition called forth much discussion. It ran to the following effect:—That no hymns of merely human composition be authorized by the Assembly to be used in public worship.

Dr. Stewart explained that the resolution meant to exclude hymns and paraphrases, and retain the Psalms of David alone.

It was afterwards moved by Dr. Stewart, and seconded by Dr. Barnett, that the words of the book of discipline be substituted for the fourth resolution, viz:—That the metrical version of the Psalms of David were the only authorized composition to be used in psalmody.

Mr. James Carlisle, Mary's Abbey, Dublin, addressed the house at great length against the motion. He said that had he been disposed to take precautions, this was one of the questions which he would have recommended to have settled before the union. But he thought then, and did think still, that it was better that it should come before the whole Assembly. The Psalms do not contain enough for Christian worship. They contemplate a Saviour to come; surely Christians knew more of him than the Psalms taught. There was much in scripture recorded of Christ which a Christian audience ought to sing. The Presbyterian Church was averse to forms. The Lord's prayer, which was called a form, was an example of prayer; so the Psalms were examples to teach us how we ought to sing the praises of God—showing how the saints of old converted various subjects into praises. So Christians should take his dealings with them under the New Testament, as the Jews did under the Old. He knew the Psalms were typical; but why should they be confined to types?—It should be remembered that this was but a small portion of the Church of God in the world, or even in these lands; many who are members of the Church of Christ use hymns, and the motion under discussion would throw censure on these persons. They should have very plain grounds before they would do so. If it were asked, can there be any better composition than the psalms, he would ask—can there be any better prayer than the Lord's prayer—or any better sermons than Paul's or Peter's. It might be said that the Psalms would fall into disuse, if other compositions were allowed; but if this would be the case, it would just prove that hymns are more suitable for Christian worship. It might be said that extempore prayer could produce no permanent evil, while written hymns might perpetuate error. The argument, he conceived, lay the other way. It would be difficult to come at error in extempore prayer; easy in written compositions. Some might object on the ground of *uniformity*—an idol before whose shrine more souls had been sacrificed than to Moloch—uniformity which produced the persecution

of their Scottish forefathers. They should study to be uniform in their obedience to the commands of God. The people in the south do not understand the Psalms. To sum up all,—It was specially said in Ephesians to worship God in “psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs.” There was a similar passage in the third chapter of Colossians. Mr. C. quoted a few passages of scripture to prove that where the word *psalmody* was used it referred to the book of Psalms, and was different from “hymns” and “spiritual songs.” If the Assembly passed the motion it might adopt the style of the Council of Constance, and say that paraphrases and hymns were excluded, not because they were contrary to scripture, and the long practice of the church, but for the sake of edification. With him it was a matter of conscience to oppose the motion. He was satisfied that much injury had been done to the people by the exclusion of hymns. The capacity to write them was a gift of God, not to be despised, but to be acknowledged with gratitude. He should be sorry if any thing he said would alienate the minds of any who wished to join the Assembly; but, on the other hand, there were more than mine who would be much grieved, if the motion were to pass.

Mr. Kennedy McKay replied to Mr. Carlisle. He said Mr. Carlisle must have spoken in ignorance of the Hebrew, according to which the Psalms were divided into “psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs.” He (Mr. C.) had also used sophistry which was calculated to throw dust in the eyes of some, and confirm others in their wild career. Hearing psalms had been the source of pestiferous error. The compositions of Basil, of Malta, led the way to the worship of saints and angels. He would contend that the paraphrases should not be used, if they contained Arianism or Arminianism, and that they did this he was prepared to prove. Mr. Carlisle, he conceived, might be arraigned for a species of blasphemy, in saying that it could not be proved that there was any foundation for singing our psalms. In Deuteronomy twenty-eighth or twenty-ninth chapter, Moses told the children of Israel to commit to memory a particular song. (Mr. C. admitted this.)—Well, continued Mr. McKay, Mr. Carlisle has given up his untenable foundation. He (Mr. Carlisle) objected to the Psalms, because they were too symbolical, but did not the Holy Spirit use metaphorical language? This language was the most effectual, for the majority of men were influenced more by sensible than intellectual ideas. He proceeded to prove that hymns and songs were introduced by Arminians, and that the Protestant Churches of Germany had been levelled by doing away with the Psalms. All churches, either heretical or going to heresy, had adopted the same plan. If the Church of Scotland had adopted paraphrases, it was matter of regret, and they should battle against this as for the supremacy of Christ. The church of Geneva (founded by Calvin himself) had departed from the truth in the same way. Twenty-five out of thirty-two churches of the Canton of Geneva had degenerated into Arianism or Neology from the same cause. It had swept away the fundamental principles of Christianity. Forty-five of the Psalms were prophetic, and the persons who gave them up had also the same ready weapons to overthrow the Arian heresy. The hymn sung by Christ and his apostles was a psalm; and Mr. C. could not show it was not. All the Psalms were sung consecutively at the Jewish feast of the passover. Mr. C. said that the Psalms must not

be divided; why, then, the divisions in the hundred and nineteenth Psalm? The paraphrases had been adopted by the Church of Scotland in a dark and gloomy hour of her history; and, if the Psalms were once departed from, the church would never get to the end of the interpolations, reveries, and fancies which would be made such an essential department of worship. If the principle of departure were once admitted, the Church would have, in the course of some time, as many adventitious appendages as the church of Rome herself. It would be impossible then to defend Protestantism: if the paraphrases were admitted, protestants would be committing *felo-de-se*. To adopt any composition but the Psalms would be to imitate the Roman Catholics, who were fond of making occasional additions. Human compositions were directly opposed to the moral law—a breach of the first commandment—and giving more honour to the lawn sleeves of the pope than to God himself. Now, they were commanded to magnify and fulfil the law, not to violate it. In the Christian church nothing but psalms were sung for the first four centuries, till the time of Arius. (Hear, hear, and cheers.)—The Synod of Antioch, in the year 213, in the reign of Aurelian, determined what books were canonical, and determined at the same time, that there were no uninspired songs. The council of Laodicea, in the year 260, confirmed that decision. He (Mr. M.K.) thought it was the intention of God in having the Psalms written in Hebrew poetry, that they should be translated into all languages. They should assist the Church of Scotland to get rid of paraphrases as well as patronage. Some were eager for meretricious worship as others for decking out the doctrines of the gospel, but both were objectionable. If they looked to the apostate protestants of France and the heretical colleges of Germany, they should think of going back to the golden days of the Reformation. While Arianism was in the Synod of Ulster, the orthodox ministers of that body would not submit to the abominable, pernicious, and heretical paraphrases. Christ himself had established worship in his church, and no human amendment was required; and he charged those who made the attempt with rebellion against Christ's authority and royal supremacy. They should not attempt to legislate for Christ. If the paraphrases were sanctioned, the union would be stultified, a new separation would take place: then farewell unity, and farewell peace. Mr. Carlisle talked of the absurdity of uniformity. Now, uniformity had always existed in the elect Church of God. Let them go on in the glorious career they had begun, and not be hoodwinked by Arians, Sabellians, &c.—all such ran down uniformity. They should and would have it, but not unless they should, once for all, protest against all human compositions. They would not be consistent protestants else. They should publish to the world that they were not warranted to use any composition as psalmody except the inspired Psalms. Never till the day of his death would he sanction any thing else, and he hoped the Assembly would be of the same opinion. (Applause.)

The Moderator said he would consider it an act of delinquency if he would not refer to one statement made by Mr. Carlisle, with respect to the alleged evils of uniformity. If Mr. C. had spoken of false, or popish, or tyrannical uniformity, it would have been all correct; but he left out the *essential difference*. It was true that *false*

uniformity had sacrificed souls, but it was not true that proper uniformity had. Another point he would not pass without his decided mark—with respect to the paraphrases. Some of them were unorthodox and nonsensical. In one of these occurred the words, "Death's pale ensigns"—what were they? Again, "Death's trembling lips" were spoken of. This was impossible.

Mr. Carlisle admitted all the expressions quoted by Dr. Cooke.—He had made the distinction as to uniformity—he had said that Scripture uniformity was good, and *mere* uniformity, when not founded upon Scripture, did sacrifice souls.

Dr. Cooke left the chair and addressed the house. He said it was his duty to say a few words, not to discuss the question, but to make some explanation. He had at one time written a defence of hymn singing and paraphrases, which was a good step, if there had not been a fallacy in the beginning. At one time he took ill on his way to Newry, and was for several weeks confined to bed in a country inn, unable to rise, but able to think; there he found that hymns were not fit to comfort a sick man, and that the Psalms were more full of meaning. He could get no hymns or paraphrases which had the truth in them. For instance, the first paraphrase, "Let heaven arise, let earth appear." The whole of the beginning of this paraphrase was heathenish—taken from the ideas of Chaos and Erebus. The phrase "smiling ray" was used—what was meant by "*smiling ray*?" Again, in another—"Oh! for a thousand tongues." Does any man want a thousand tongues in his mouth? If the whole collection of Scottish paraphrases were examined, it would be found that they contained much false doctrine. The hymns attached were full of errors. For instance—"sorrow's weight" occurred in one. What was the *weight* of sorrow? Again, the "dying groans" of the Saviour was substituted for the intercession and resurrection. The argument of Mr. Carlisle was dangerous to an infidel and semi-infidel world. He knew not why it was that all the devil's servants did not like David. He was sure that Mr. Carlisle did not intend to give an arrow to the enemy—one of the usual barbs used against David's character. He thought they should pass the resolution of approval, just as the Shorter Catechism was authorized, without preventing the use of Fisher's and others of good character. If Mair's were used, it would be time to interfere. He wished the resolution to state the truth and no more. For his own part, he got the binder to leave the paraphrases out of his book, so that no minister who might occupy his pulpit could have the opportunity of using paraphrases. He hoped the resolution would pass in its simplicity, and then let the church legislate when it might be necessary.

Mr. Josias Wilson said he was in the habit of singing paraphrases. He had a congregation of 3,000 people, and he did not wish it to be thought that he was in the habit of singing errors and blasphemy.—

Some farther discussion ensued, when the resolution was at length passed.

The obstacle to the union of the dissentients being now removed,

Dr. Rentoul, on behalf of eight ministers, stated that they were now satisfied and ready to unite with the Assembly. The clerk forthwith added to the roll the names of the late dissentients, with the exception of one minister who had become connected with another body.—*Londonderry Standard*.

The Cause of God and Truth.

It is said, that if Christ died not for all men, God could not equitably require all men to repent; and it is asked, What good could this repentance do them? what remission of sins could it procure? and therefore must be in vain; yea, that it would follow from hence, that no impenitent person can be justly condemned for dying in his impenitent estate. To which I reply; it does not become us to fix what is, and what is not equitable for God to require of his creatures, on supposition of Christ's dying or not dying for them: this is limiting the Holy One of Israel. Supposing Christ had not died for any of the sons of men; have they not all sinned and transgressed the commands of God? and should they not be sorry for these sins, and repent of the same, being committed against the God of their mercies? and might not God equitably require this at their hands, though he had not given his Son to die for them? and though such a repentance would not procure remission of sins, which is not to be procured by any repentance whatever; nor is it by the repentance of those for whom Christ has died, but by his precious blood, without which there is no remission; yet it might be the means of enjoying a present temporal good, and lessening the aggravation of future punishment; as in the case of the Ninevites. Nor does it follow from Christ's not dying for all men, that no impenitent person can be justly condemned for dying in his impenitent estate; since the providential *goodness of God leads to repentance*;* and, therefore, such who "despise the riches of his goodness, forbearance, and long-suffering," do, "after" their "hardness and impenitent heart, treasure up wrath against the day of wrath, and righteous judgment of God;" and since, "as many as have sinned without law,"† and consequently without the gospel and the knowledge of Christ, his sufferings, and death, "shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law. Besides, as has been observed, the exhortation to repent, here made, is not made unto all men, but "to the Jews," on a very remarkable occasion, and was blessed to many of them, to the turning them away from their iniquities; for "many of them which heard the word, believed; and the number of the men was about five thousand.‡

If it should be replied, that though the exhortation to repentance is not here made to all men; yet it is elsewhere expressly said, that § "God commandeth all men every where to repent." Let it be observed, that as this command to repentance does not suppose it to be in the power of man; nor contradicts its being a free grace gift of God; nor its being a blessing in the covenant of grace, and in the hands of Christ to bestow; so neither does it extend, as here expressed, to every individual of mankind; but only regards the men of the then present age, in distinction from those who lived in the former "times of ignorance;" for so the words are expressed: "and the times of this ignorance God winked at;" overlooked, took no notice of, sent them no messages, enjoined them no commands of faith in Christ, or repentance towards God; "but now," since the coming and death of Christ, "commandeth all men," Gentiles as well as Jews, "every where to repent;" it being his will, that || "re-

* Rom. ii. 4, 5. † Ver. 12. ‡ Acts iv. 4. § Chap. xvii. 30. || Luke xxiv. 47.

penitance and remission of sins should be preached among all nations:" but admitting that it has been God's command in all ages, and to all men that they repent; as all men are indeed bound, by the law of nature, to a natural repentance, though all men are not called by the gospel to an evangelical one; yet I see not what conclusions can be formed from hence against either absolute election or particular redemption.

3. Though there is a close connexion between evangelical repentance, true conversion, and pardon of sin; that is to say, that such who are really converted and truly repent, have their sins pardoned; yet not repentance and conversion, but the free grace of God and blood of Christ are the causes of pardon. Forgiveness of sin is indeed only manifested to converted penitent sinners, who are encouraged and influenced to repent of sin, and turn to the Lord from the promise of pardoning grace: hence the most that can be made of such an exhortation is only this; that it is both the duty and interest of men to repent and turn to God, that they may have a discovery of the remission of their sins through the blood of Christ, and not that they shall hereby procure and obtain the thing itself: though, after all, neither evangelical repentance and internal conversion, nor the grace of pardon, are here intended; not evangelical repentance and internal conversion, as has been before observed, nor the spiritual blessing and grace of pardon; for, though pardon of sin is signified by blotting it out, Psal. li. 1, 9; Isa. xliii. 25, and xliv. 22; yet forgiveness of sin sometimes means no more than the removing a present calamity, or the averting of a threatened judgment, Exod. xxxii. 32; 1 Kings viii. 33 to 39, and is the sense of the phrase here. These Jews had crucified the Lord of glory, and for this sin were threatened with miserable destruction; the apostle therefore exhorts them to repent of it, and acknowledge Jesus to be the true Messiah: that so when "wrath" should come upon their nation "to the uttermost," they might be delivered and saved from the general calamity; which, though these would be terrible times to the unbelieving Jews, yet would be "times of refreshing" to the people of God from troubles and persecutions. Though the last clause may be considered, not as expressing the time when their iniquities should be blotted out, but as a distinct additional promise made to penitents, and be read with the other thus: "that your sins may be blotted out, that the times of refreshing may come;" as they are by the Syriac and Arabic versions, and to which the Ethiopic agrees, and is the reading preferred by Lightfoot; and the sense is this: "Repent of your sin of crucifying Christ; acknowledge Jesus as the true Messiah, and you shall not only be saved from the general destruction of your nation, but shall have the gospel and the consolation of Israel with you. Jesus Christ, who was first preached unto you, shall be sent down unto you in the refreshing consolatory ministry of the word, though he in person must remain in heaven, "until the times of restitution of all things."

SECTION XXXIII.

Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye.—Acts vii. 51.

THOUGH these words are not once cited or referred to by Dr. Whitby, as I remember, yet, inasmuch as the Remonstrants* have never failed to urge them in favour of the resistibility of God's grace in conversion, and to prove that that work is not wrought by an irresistible power; and that men may have sufficient grace for conversion who are not converted, it will be proper not to omit them; their argument from them stands thus: If the Holy Spirit may be resisted when he acts in man with a purpose and will to convert him, then he does not work conversion by an irresistible power; but the Holy Spirit may be resisted when he acts in man with a purpose and will to convert him: therefore, &c. But,

1. That the Spirit of God in the operations of his grace upon the heart in conversion may be resisted, that is, opposed, is allowed; but that he may be so resisted as to be overcome, or be hindered in, or obliged to cease from the work of conversion, so as that it comes to nothing, where he acts with purpose and will to convert, must be denied, "for who hath resisted his will?" who, in this sense, can resist it? No one instance of this kind can ever be produced.

2. It should be proved that the Spirit of God was in these persons, and was acting in them with a design to convert them, and that they had sufficient grace for conversion given them, and that that grace was the same with that which is given to persons who are always converted; whereas it does not appear that they had any grace at all, since they are said to be "stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart and ears."

3. Supposing the Spirit of God was acting in them with a purpose and will to convert them, it will be difficult to prove that they so resisted, and continued to resist him, as that they were not hereafter converted by him; we are sure that one of these persons, namely Saul, was afterwards really and truly converted; and how many more were so we know not.

4. The resistance made by these persons was not to the Spirit of God in them, of which they were destitute, but to the Spirit of God in his ministers, in his apostles, and particularly Stephen; not to any internal operation of his grace, which does not appear to have been in them, but to the external ministry of the word, and to all that objective light, knowledge, evidence, and conviction, that it gave of Jesus being the Messiah; in which sense they are said to "reject the counsel of God against themselves," Luke vii. 30; and to "put from" them "the word of God," Acts xiii. 46. Such who resist Christ's ministers, resist him; and such who resist him may be said to resist his Holy Spirit. Once more,

The word *antipneuste*, signifies a rushing against, and falling upon, in a rude and hostile manner; and fitly expresses their ill treatment of Christ and his ministers, by falling upon them and putting them to death, which is the resistance here particularly designed, as is manifest from the following words, ver. 52.

* In Coll. Hag. art. iii. iv. p. 215; Acta Synod. p. 70, &c.; Limborch, l. 4, c. 13, sect. 14, p. 373.

SECTION XXXIV.

Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men to justification of life.—Rom. v. 18.

THESE words stand as a proof of general redemption; and the sense given of them is,* that Christ died for the justification of all men; and that justification of life was procured by him for, and is offered unto, all men; it being apparent that the apostle is comparing the condemnation which is procured by the sin of Adam, with the free gift of justification procured by the second Adam, as to the extent of persons concerned in both; “all men,” in the first clause, being to be taken in the utmost latitude, the same word in the latter clause must be taken in the same manner, or the grace of the comparison is wholly lost. To all which I reply;

1. These words say nothing at all about the death of Christ, or of his dying for any persons or any thing, but speak of his righteousness and the virtue of it, to justification of life; by which righteousness is meant his active obedience, as appears from the following verse: nor do the Scriptures any where say, that Christ died for our justification, but that he “died for our sins, and rose again for our justification.” It is true indeed that justification is procured by the death, as well as the obedience of Christ; as that we are “justified by his blood,” as well as by his righteousness; but it cannot be said, with any propriety, that justification of life is “offered” to any; since justification is a forensic, a law term, and signifies a sentence pronounced, or declared, and not offered. A judge, when he either acquits or condemns, does not offer the sentence of justification or condemnation, but pronounces either: so God, when he justifies, does not offer justification to men, but pronounces them righteous, through the righteousness of his Son; and when Christ procured justification, it was not an offer of it, but the blessing itself. These words, then, are not to be understood either of Christ’s dying for justification for any, especially for every individual man; since all men, in this large sense, are not justified; many will be righteously condemned, and eternally punished; and consequently his death, respecting them, must be in vain, were this the case; nor of the procuring of justification, still less of the offer of it, but of the application of it to the persons here mentioned.

2. It is apparent, that the apostle is here comparing the first and the second Adam together, as heads and representatives of their respective offspring, and the effects of sin, to the condemnation of those that sprang from the one, with the grace of God to the justification of such that belong to the other, and not the number of persons concerned in these things. His plain meaning is, that as the first Adam conveyed sin, condemnation, and death, to all his posterity; so the second Adam communicates grace, righteousness, and life, to all his posterity; and herein the latter has the preference to the former, and in which lies “the abundance of grace” here spoken of; that the things communicated by the one are, in their own nature, to be preferred to the other; and particularly, that the righteousness which Christ gives to his, not only justifies from the sin of the first Adam,

* Whitby, p. 113, 117, 118; ed. 2. 111, 115, 116.

and secures from all condemnation by it, but also from all other offences whatever, and gives a right to eternal life; wherefore it is called "the justification of life," which the first Adam "never had." Were the comparison between the numbers of such who are condemned by the sin of the one, and of those who are justified by the righteousness of the other, the numbers being the same, the grace of the comparison would be wholly lost; for where would be the exuberance when there is perfect equality?

3. Admitting that the apostle is comparing the condemnation which was procured by the sin of Adam with the free gift of justification procured by the second Adam, as to the extent of persons concerned in both; this extent cannot be thought to reach to more than such who respectively spring from them, and belong to them. No more could be condemned by the sin of Adam than those who naturally descended from him by ordinary generation. The angels that fell are not condemned for Adam's sin, from whom they did not spring, but for their own personal iniquities. This sin reached not to the man Christ Jesus, nor was he condemned by it for himself, because he descended not from Adam by ordinary generation; so no more can be justified by the righteousness of Christ, nor does that reach to the justification of more than those who are Christ's, that belong to him, and who are in time regenerated by his Spirit and grace, and appear to be his spiritual seed and offspring.

4. "All men," in the latter clause of this text, can never design every individual of mankind; for if "the free gift came upon all men," in this large sense, "to justification of life," every man would have a righteousness to be justified, be secure from wrath to come, have a right to eternal life, and at last be glorified and everlastingly saved: for such who are "justified by the blood of Christ, shall be saved from wrath through him;"* and "whom" God "justifies, them he also glorifies." Now it is certain, that all men, in the utmost latitude of this phrase, have not a justifying righteousness; there is a set of unrighteous men who shall not inherit the kingdom of God, are not, nor will they ever be justified; but the wrath of God abides on them, and will be their everlasting portion: could it be proved that the righteousness of Christ is imputed by the Father, and applied by the Spirit, to the justification of every man, and that every man will be saved, we shall readily come in to the doctrine of universal redemption by the death of Christ. But,

5. The apostle is the best interpreter of his own words, and we may easily learn, from this epistle, who the "all men" are, to whom "the free gift" by Christ's righteousness comes, to "justification of life:" they are "the elect" whom God "justifies," through the righteousness of his Son, and secures from condemnation by his death, chap. viii. 33, 34; they are all the seed to whom "the promise" of righteousness and life belongs, and is sure, chap. iv. 16; they are "the all that believe," upon whom and unto whom the righteousness of Christ is manifested, revealed, and applied by the Spirit of God, chap. iii. 22; and they are such who "receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness, chap. v. 17; and, in a word, the gift comes upon all those that are Christ's, and belong to him to justification, even as judgment came upon all to condem-

* Rom. v. 9, and viii. 30.

nation, through the offence of Adam, that belong to him, or descend from him.

The text in 1 Cor. xv. 22, "for as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive," in which the same comparison is made between the two heads, Adam and Christ, and their different effects, and which is sometimes used in favour of general redemption, is foreign to the purpose, since it speaks not of redemption by Christ, nor of spiritual and eternal life through him, but of the resurrection of the dead, as is evident from the whole context; and that not of every individual man, only of such as "are Christ's," and who "sleep" in him, of whom he is "the first fruits," ver. 20, 23; who will be raised by virtue of union to him, and "come forth unto the resurrection of life;" which all will not, for some will "awake to shame and everlasting contempt," yea, to the "resurrection of damnation," which, by the way, is a proof that the word "all" does not always design every individual of mankind.

SECTION XXXV.

For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all—
Rom. xi. 32.

THIS passage of scripture is produced as a proof of God's will, that all men should be saved, and to show that he has rejected none from salvation by an absolute and antecedent decree, and consequently that Christ died for all men; seeing as God hath concluded all men in unbelief, none excepted, so, by the rule of opposition, he hath mercy on all, none excepted.* To which I answer:

1. That God shows mercy to all men in a providential way, is granted, for "his tender mercies are over all his works;"† but that all men are partakers of his special mercy through Christ, must be denied, since "the vessels of mercy" are manifestly distinguished from "the vessels of wrath fitted for destruction;"‡ and certain it is, that there are some whom "he that made them will not have mercy on them, and he that formed them will show them no favour;"§ and where God does extend his special mercy, it is wholly owing to his sovereign will and pleasure, "for he hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.||

2. By the rule of opposition, no more can be thought to be the objects of God's mercy than those whom he has shut up in unbelief, which is not true of all men that ever were in the world; for, though all men are, by nature, unbelievers, yet they are not all shut up by God in unbelief. To be "shut up in unbelief," is the same as to be "concluded under sin," the meaning of which phrases is, not that God makes men sinners and unbelievers, or puts them into the prison of sin and unbelief, but that he proves, demonstrates, and convinces them, that they are in such a state and condition, as Chrysostom¶ on the other place observes, and which is the sense that Grotius and Vorstius,** who were both on the other side of the question, give of these words; for such who are savingly convinced of sin, are held and bound down by a sense of it in their consciences, that they can

* Limborch, l. 4, c. 5, sect. 6, p. 333.

§ Isa. xxvii. 11.

|| Rom. ix. 18.

† Psalm cxlv. 9.

¶ In Paræus in loc.

‡ Rom. ix. 22, 23.

** In loc.

find no by-way to creep out, or make any excuse for it. Now, all men are not in this sense concluded under sin, or shut up in unbelief, none but those whom the Spirit of God reproves and convinces of these things; which convictions are wrought in them, on purpose that they may flee, not to their own merits, but to the mercy of God, which they may hope to share in, since "with the Lord is mercy, and with him is plenteous redemption.*

3. It is not said absolutely, "God hath concluded, *παντας*, all in unbelief, that he might have mercy, *παντας*, on all;" but "God hath concluded, *τους παντας*, them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy, *τους παντας*, on them all," which limits and restrains the "all" to the persons the apostle is speaking of in the context; were the elect of God among the Jews and Gentiles, and so designs "the fulness of the Gentiles," whom God determined to bring in, ver. 25, and especially "that all Israel," ver. 26, that "shall be saved," not by their own righteousness, but by the pure mercy and free grace of God. In short, by the "all" whom he has mercy on, and in order to bring them to a sense of their need thereof, concludes in, and convinces of, unbelief, are to be understood all believers, that is, who are eventually so, be they Jews or Gentiles, as Vorstius observes,† and which is manifest from a parallel text, "The scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe."‡ Hence this passage neither militates against an absolute election, nor special redemption of particular persons.

SECTION XXXVI.

Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died.—Rom. xiv. 15.

THESE words are frequently§ used in favour of universal redemption, and to prove that Christ died not only for the elect, for his sheep, and true believers, but also for them that perish; and the argument from them is formed|| thus: "If Christ died for them that perish, and for them that do not perish, he died for all. But Christ died for them that perish, and for them that do not perish; "ergo," he died for all men. That he died for them that do not perish, is confessed by all; and that he died for such as may, or shall perish, is intimated in this injunction; "destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died." But whether so much is intimated hereby, will be seen when the following things are considered:

1. That the injunction "destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died," does not intend eternal destruction; since that can never be thought to be either in the will or the power of those on whom this is enjoined. Such a degree of malice and wickedness surely can never arise in the heart of any, to wish for, desire, and take any steps towards the eternal damnation of others; what comes nearest to such an instance, is the Jews' prohibition of the apostles, "to speak to the Gentiles, that they might be saved;"¶ which discovered implacable and inveterate malice indeed; but surely nothing

* Psalm cxxx. 7.

† In loc.

‡ Gal. iii. 22.

§ Remonstr. in Coll. Hag. art. ii. p. 132; Act. Synod. p. 346, &c.; Curcell. l. 6, c. 4, sec. 7, p. 360; Limborch, l. 4, c. 3, sect. 9, p. 321.

|| Whitby, p. 132; ed. 2. 235.

¶ 1 Thess. ii. 16.

of this kind could ever be among brethren of the same faith, and in the same church state; and were any so wicked as to desire the eternal destruction of another, yet it is not in his power to compass it; none can eternally destroy but God; "fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul;" but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Besides, is it reasonable to suppose, or conclude, that eternal damnation should follow upon eating and drinking things indifferent, as herbs, meat, and wine, or be caused by an offence given and taken through these things? Therefore, unless it can be proved, that eternal destruction did or might ensue upon the use of things indifferent; or that weak brethren might or were so insnared, offended, and stumbled hereby, as to perish eternally, there is no force in the argument.

2. It will appear from the context, that the destruction of the weak brother dehorted from, is not the eternal destruction of his person; but the present destruction, interruption, or hinderance of his peace and comfort. To "destroy" the brother "with meat," is, by eating it, to "put a stumbling, or an occasion to fall in his way," ver. 13; not to fall from the grace and favour of God; but so as that the peace of his mind may be broken, his affections to the brethren wax cold, and he be staggered in the doctrines of the gospel: hence says the apostle, "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak," ver. 21; to do which, is contrary to Christian charity; "if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably;" yea, it is "destroying the work of God," ver. 20; not the Christian convert, who is God's workmanship; nor "the good work of grace," which will be "performed until the day of Christ;" nor the work of faith, which will never fail;† but the work of peace in churches, and particular persons, which God is the author of, and which, the things that make for it, saints should follow after, ver. 19. Now a weaker brother, for whom Christ has died, may be thus grieved, distressed, wounded, his peace destroyed, and yet not eternally perish; and so can be no instance of Christ's dying for such as may be or are eternally lost. The apostle's design in this dehortation, is manifestly this; partly from the interest Christ has in, and the love he has showed to such brethren in dying for them; and partly from the hurt that may be done to their weak minds and consciences, to deter stronger believers from giving them any offence by their free use of things indifferent; though he knew their eternal salvation could not be in any danger thereby.

SECTION XXXVII.

And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?—
1 Cor. viii. 11.

THESE words are commonly joined with the former, and produced for the same purposes, both to prove that Christ died for such as perish, and that true believers may totally and finally fall away.‡ What has been said under the preceding section, might be sufficient

* Matt. x. 28.

† Vid. Whitby, p. 436, 442; ed. 2. 425, 431.

‡ Whitby, p. 138, 436, 442; ed. 2. 135, 425, 431.

to lead us into the true sense of this text, which is parallel with the other, and so remove any argument or objection taken from hence. But not to let it pass without particular examination, let it be observed;

1. That as the text in Rom. xiv. 15, is a dehoration, or an injunction not to destroy him with meat, for whom Christ died; this is delivered out in the form of an interrogation; and neither the one nor the other prove matter of fact, supposing they could be understood of eternal destruction and ruin; as that any one brother, who was a true believer, was destroyed, or perished eternally this way; and at most, only imply the danger and possibility thereof, through their own corruptions, Satan's temptations, and the offences given by stronger brethren; were they not preserved by the grace and power of God, through Christ, who died for them, and so will not suffer them to perish.

2. The "perishing" of this weak brother, is to be understood of, and is explained by, a "defiling" of his conscience, ver. 7; a "wounding" of it, ver. 12; and making him to "offend" ver. 13; by the imprudent abuse of Christian liberty in those who had stronger faith, and greater knowledge, and by a participation of things offered to idols, in an idol's temple, ver. 7, 10; and not of his eternal damnation in hell, which could never enter into the apostle's thoughts; since he says, ver. 8, "Meat commendeth us not to God; for neither if we eat, are we the better; neither, if we eat not, are we the worse." Hence we have no need to return for answer, to arguments formed on these texts; that these weak brethren, of whom it is supposed that they might perish, being under a profession of religion, men were obliged, from a judgment of charity, to believe that Christ died for them, though he might not, or that others may be said to destroy, or cause them to perish, though their destruction followed not; because they did all that in them lay towards it, and what in its own nature tended to it; and therefore we are not concerned with the replies made unto such answers, which we shall not undertake to defend.

3. This text proves, that Christ died for weak brethren, whose consciences may be defiled, wounded, and offended, through the liberty others might take, and in this sense perish; but does not prove that Christ died for any besides his sheep, his church; or those who are eventually true believers; for which the Remonstrants* cite it; for surely a brother who is truly one, though weak, is a sheep of Christ, a member of his church, and a believer; and therefore can be no instance of Christ's dying for any reprobates, and still less for all mankind.

4. Such for whom Christ died, can never finally, totally, and eternally perish; since he has, by his death, procured such blessings for them, as a justifying righteousness, pardon of sin, peace with God, reconciliation to him, and eternal salvation; which will for ever secure them from perishing. Besides, should any of them perish in this sense, his death would so far be in vain; nor could the death of Christ be thought to be a sufficient security from condemnation; whereas the apostle says, "Who shall condemn? it is Christ that

* In Coll. Hag. art. ii. p. 173.

died:" nor a full satisfaction to the justice of God; or God must be unjust to punish twice for the same faults.

SECTION XXXVIII.

Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall.—1 Cor. x. 12.

IT is observed,* that "the apostle here speaks to the whole church at Corinth, and to such who truly thought they stood; and plainly supposes, that he who truly stood, might fall, and would do so, if he used not great diligence to keep his standing; for had not this "taking heed" been the condition of their standing; had they been of the number of those who, by God's decree, or promise, infallibly were assured of standing, this exhortation to take heed, must have been superfluous; since men can need no admonitions to do that which God's decree and promise secure them they cannot omit; much less to do it to prevent what cannot possibly befall them." To which I reply;

1. That the apostle does not speak these words to the whole church at Corinth; for though the epistle is in general directed to the church, yet there are several things which only respect some particular persons; as the incestuous person; such who went to law with their brethren before unbelievers; some that behaved disorderly at the Lord's table, and others that denied the resurrection of the dead, of and to whom some particular things are spoken, which did not belong to the whole church; and here the apostle exhorts, not such who truly thought they stood; for such do stand in the grace of God, in Christ, and by faith, and shall never finally and totally fall away; but such ο δοκῶν, who seemeth to himself and others "to stand;" and manifestly designs such who were swelled with a vain opinion of themselves, of their knowledge and strength, tempted God, and "trusted to" themselves, as the Ethiopic version reads it, and despised weak believers: now such as these may fall, as they often do, from that which they seemed to have, from the truths of the gospel, and a profession of it, and into scandalous sins, and at last, into condemnation. If it should be asked, why should the apostle concern himself about these persons, or exhort them to take heed to their standing? would it not have been as well, if they had thrown off the mask at once, and have appeared to be what they really were? I answer, that the apostacy of formal professors, is injurious both to the honour and interest of true religion; for the ways of God are evil spoken of, the name of Christ blasphemed, profane sinners hardened, and weak believers stumbled by the falls of formal professors, as of real Christians: besides, it must be worse for themselves, their defection being the means of a more severe punishment: "for it would have been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them."†

2. Supposing that such who truly thought they stood, true believers in Christ, are here spoken to; it will be allowed that these may fall into temptation, into snares, into sin, from a degree of steadfastness in the gospel, and from a lively and comfortable exercise of

* Whitby, p. 428, 429; ed. 2. 417, 418.

† 2 Pet. ii. 21.

grace, but not finally, totally, and irrecoverably; since they are enclosed in the arms of everlasting love, secured in the hands of Christ, built on a foundation that will never give way, and kept by an almighty power, which can never be overcome: and though taking heed is not the condition of their standing, but that is secured unto them by the purpose and promise of God, which can never fail; yet such an exhortation is not superfluous; since though they cannot finally and totally fall, they may fall to the dishonour of God, the reproach of the gospel of Christ, the grieving of the Spirit, the wounding of their own souls, the stumbling of weak believers, and the strengthening of the hands of the wicked; all which are so many strong reasons and arguments why they should take heed lest they fall; though they can never so fall as to perish eternally: nor are the admonitions needless to that which God's decree and promise secure; since these are often the means in and by which God executes his decree, and makes good his promise; see Acts xxvii. 22, 24, 31. To add no more, these words should never be made use of against the saints' final perseverance, since they are so closely connected with the following verse, which so fully expresses that doctrine: "there hath no temptation taken you, but such as is common to man. But God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it." By this way we may judge of the nature, design, and use of cautions given to the saints not to fall away; which are represented* as evidences and suppositions that they may do so; such as

The caution Christ gave all his disciples, in these words: "Take heed unto yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting,† &c. Which only implies, that the apostles, like other men, were subject to infirmities, sins, snares, and temptations; and, therefore, caution, watchfulness, and prayer, were incumbent on them, that they might not be found in a supine, negligent, sleepy frame, when not the day of judgment, but of the destruction of Jerusalem, came on; and so they might escape the general calamity, and stand before the Son of man, and carry his gospel into the Gentile world; and is no proof of the possibility or danger of their final falling away; who were chosen of Christ, given him by his Father, and so kept by him, as that none were lost, but the son of perdition.

When the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews cautions the believers he writes unto, to "take heed, lest there be in any of them an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God," and fall from the promised rest: and to "look diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God;"‡ his design is to expose the sin of unbelief, as what bereaved the saints of much comfort, and God of much glory; every degree of it in that, being a partial, though not a total departure from God, and therefore should be watched against: and it should be observed, that he does not caution them to take heed lest they fell from the rest promised them, but lest they "should seem to come short of it:" which they might do and yet enjoy it: and when he exhorts them, to "look diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God;" this is not to be understood of the grace and fa-

* Whitby, p. 429, 430; ed. 2. 418, 419.

† Luke xxi. 34, 39.

‡ Heb. iii. 12, and iv. 1, and xii. 15.

vour of God towards them, nor of the grace of God in them, but of the doctrines of grace which they had received; the duty enjoined them being a mutual one, in which they were *επισκοπεῖν*, to act the part of a bishop or overseer over each other.

When the apostle Paul cautions the Colossians,* to "beware, lest any man should beguile them with enticing words, spoil them through philosophy and vain deceit, and beguile them of their reward;" he does not design a final and total seduction of them from Christ their head, in whom they were complete, ver. 10; not a destruction of grace in them, but a corruption of the doctrine of grace received by them; which might be unawares introduced by false teachers, under the specious pretences of humility and holiness.

When the apostle Peter† exhorts those he wrote to, to "beware, lest being led away with the error of the wicked," they "fall from their own steadfastness;" his meaning is, not as though there was danger or a possibility of falling from the "like precious faith" they had "obtained;" but that they might be in danger of falling from some degree of steadfastness in the doctrine of faith, through the insinuating errors of wicked men; and therefore should guard against it.

Lastly. When the apostle John‡ saith to the children of the elect lady, "Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things that we have wrought, but that we receive a full reward;" it does not follow, that such who have the true grace of God may lose those things which they have wrought; for it is not what "ye," but what "we" have wrought; much less lose what the Spirit of God has wrought: but the caution regards the doctrines and ministry of the apostles, lest that should be in any respect in vain; or a veil be drawn over the glory of it, through these persons any way giving heed to the doctrines of deceivers, ver. 7, 9, 10.

SECTION XXXIX.

For the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: and that he died for all, that they which live, should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again.—2 Cor. v. 14, 15.

THIS scripture§ never fails to have a place in the controversy about the extent of the death of Christ. Universal redemption is concluded from hence, by the following arguments, now to be examined.

I. The first is taken from the word "all,"|| here used, "if," or "since one died for all. But it ought to be observed,

1. That the text does not say that Christ died for "all men," but for "all;" and, therefore, agreeably to other scriptures,¶ may be understood of all "the people" whom Jesus saves from their sins; of all "the sheep" for whom he laid down his life; of all the members of his "church" whom he loved, and for whom he gave himself; or, of all "the sons" for whom he tasted death, and, as the Captain of their salvation, brings to glory.

* Col. ii. 4, 8, 18.

† 2 Pet. iii. 17.

‡ 2 John ver. 8.

§ Remonstr. in Coll. Hag. art. ii. p. 132; Curcellæus, l. 6, c. 4, sect. 6. p. 360; Limboreh, l. 4, c. 3, sect. 3, 4, p. 319.

|| Whitby, p. 112; ed. 2. 111.

¶ Matt. i. 21; John x. 15; Eph. v. 25; Heb. ii. 9, 10.

Presbytery of Philadelphia.

November 3, 1841.

A PAPER from the Presbytery of Cambridge was laid on the table of Presbytery, complaining of certain words used in the Religious Monitor, November number of volume 17th, page 267, beginning fourth line from the top. The Presbytery of Cambridge say, "It is believed these words maintain a legal doctrine, namely, that the believer's holiness is the procuring cause or ground of his access to God, of his enjoyment of divine protection and of his heirship to glory."

Reply to the Presbytery of Cambridge.

I regard all legal views of any of the blessings of the covenant of grace with abhorrence, as such views are subversive of the gospel of the grace of God. Salvation in all its parts is wholly of grace.—"Grace reigns." The doctrine, "That the believer's holiness is the procuring cause, or ground of his access to God, of his enjoyment of the divine protection, and of his heirship to glory," never entered my imagination. The spirit dwelling in the soul, revealing Christ, the soul apprehending by faith Christ, as the meritorious and procuring cause of all its spiritual mercies, I suppose constitutes that vital union between God and his people, which is indissoluble. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour." Tit. iii. 5, 6. So far as the language in the Monitor may seem to imply any other view, it is to be condemned.

C. WEBSTER.

Philadelphia, November 3, 1841.

The foregoing reply was approved by Presbytery and ordered to be published.

Obituary.

DIED on the 8th instant, at the house of Mr. Robert Laird, in this city, the Rev. DAVID ANDERSON, late Pastor of the Associate Presbyterian Congregation of Carlisle, Pa., in the 56th year of his age and 30th of his ministry.

The deceased was a native of Perth, Scotland, and Pastor of the Seceder Congregation at Boghole for twenty-five years. He came to this country with his family in 1839, and was installed Pastor of the Carlisle Congregation and its branches on the 14th day of October, 1841. He was called to assist at the administration of the Lord's Supper in the Second Associate Congregation in this city on the last Sabbath in October, in which congregation he will long be remembered for his work of faith and labour of love, in his master's service, and his zeal and fervour in addressing his fellow men on the great doctrines of salvation by free grace, reigning through righteousness in our Lord Jesus Christ: and in his last discourse from 1 Cor. 16, 23, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you," he seemed to anticipate the end of his labours here, and the crown of life which awaits God's faithful servants. It might properly be called his farewell sermon.

On the 4th ult., returning from the Blockley almshouse, to attend a meeting of the Associate Presbytery in this city, and crossing

the Schuylkill in a boat, when stepping out, he slipped and fell; but not being aware of much injury, continued on his way to the meeting, where he sat for some time, and finding himself chilly, walked to his lodging, where he was attended by three of our most eminent physicians, who pronounced his disease a rupture of the kidneys, &c., occasioned by a fall. The seat of his disease could not be reached; and he continued to suffer excruciating pain until Monday the 8th, about half-past one o'clock P. M., when he was released from the body to be present with the Lord. He was a man eminent for his close walk with God—a man of prayer, of sound principles and pleasing address, and appeared to be entirely abstracted from the world, and devoted to the great work of winning souls to Christ. To one who waited at his bedside, he said, that he had long since been enabled to trust his all into the hands of his Redeemer, and He had never disappointed him: I have not found Him to be a barren wilderness, or a land of drought. On the day before he died he said, "This is the first Sabbath in thirty years that I have been unable to attend to the public services of the sanctuary. At one time he said, "O! if it be possible, let this cup pass from me." It was observed that those were the words of the Saviour, while suffering in the room of His people. "O yes," he replied; "but He said, 'Not my will, but thine be done,'—so would I say: I have much darkness and sore temptation, but I hope soon to obtain the victory—I would not let go my hope on Christ for a thousand worlds—my couch does not ease me; but I shall go down by the sides of the grave." The precious word of God seemed to be ever in his mind, and very many sweet promises were repeated by him. A few minutes before his death, while in great agony, he said, "O, my dear Saviour, come quickly." He desired to be assisted to turn on his side, in which position, in about thirty minutes, he breathed out his soul into the hands of God who gave it.—"Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord." Let his family remember the promise which gave comfort to the deceased, "Leave thy fatherless children, I will preserve them alive, and let thy widows trust in me." D.

Controversy.

In the apprehension of some, religious controversy is productive only of unmitigated evils, and they are almost disposed to question the divine wisdom in permitting it. We are ready to admit that the necessity for it arises from the obliquity of mind and heart produced by the apostacy of our nature, but constituted as we are, we may justify its necessity, and the wisdom of God in permitting it on these grounds:

1st. That it evinces the depravity of our nature, which has made truth so difficult of acquisition, subject to so many perversions, that even the best men in its defence, are apt to betray pitiable infirmities of temper; and in producing this conviction, it may serve to humble the pride of man, and induce him to rely upon God for wisdom to illuminate his mind and direct his steps.

2d. It may be permitted, because, with all the incidental evils attendant upon it, it serves to elicit truth. Its advantages in this respect, are known and acknowledged by all who have impartially examined its results.

3d. May it not be permitted in order to convince those who have been involved in its turmoil, that heaven is truly desirable, where the people of God shall see eye to eye, and without any of the jar-rings of earth, shall love one another with pure hearts fervently? Heavenly rest will be the finishing of all controversy.—*Presbyt'n.*

Bunyan's Prefiguration of the Oxford Theology.

In looking at the beautiful edition of *The Holy War*, just issued by the American Sunday School Union, I found a passage which seems to have had a prophetic view to our own times, and which deserves to be cited as a curiosity. It begins thus:

"The King's captains, when they marched from the court to come up against Mansoul to war, as they came crossing over the country, they happened to light upon three young fellows that had a mind to go for soldiers: proper men they were, and men of courage and skill, to appearance. Their names were Mr. Tradition, Mr. Human Wisdom and Mr. Man's Invention. So they came up to the captains and proffered their services to Shaddai."

The three recruits went into the war under Captain Boanerges, but in a sally by a company of Lord Willbewill's men, they were taken prisoners. They were brought before Diabolus, and after being remanded for a time to prison, the rest of their story is told as follows.

"Not many days after, he sent for them to him again, and he asked them if they would be willing to serve him against their former captains. They then told him that they did not so much live by religion as by the fate of fortune; and that since his lordship was willing to entertain them, they should be willing to serve him. Now while things were thus in hand there was one Captain Anything, a great doer, in the town of Mansoul; and to this Captain Anything did Diabolus send these men, with a note under his hand, to receive them into his company; the contents of this letter were thus:

"Anything, my darling.—The three men that are the bearers of this letter have a desire to serve me in the war; nor know I better to whose conduct to commit them than to thine. Receive them, therefore, in my name, and, as need shall require, make use of them against Shaddai and his men. Farewell."

"So they came, and he received them; and he made two of them sergeants; but he made Mr. Man's Invention his armour bearer."

Time has proved, Mr. Editor, that Diabolus seldom secured a more important accession to his ranks than he did on this occasion, and the spirit of this noble trio is even in our day drawing off many into the track of their own apostacy, and strengthening, for a season, the bands of Captain Anything and his great chief.—*Presbyterian.*

Persecution of the Christians in Turkey.—The German papers state that new atrocities had been committed on the Christian population of the Turkish provinces. The Augsburg Gazette, under date, Frontiers of Turkey, 12th ult., states that Ali Pasha had expelled more than three hundred Christian families from their dwellings at Marstan, who were obliged to bivouac in the open fields.

Human Life Painted to the Life.

Some of Baxter's sketches are inimitable. He seems almost without a figure, to have looked on this world and its affairs in the light of eternity. When he describes the pursuits and ambition of men, he makes their littleness appear something as we may conceive they will appear, when from eternity we come to see them in the retrospect. He speaks of the vain show of man's bustling life as follows: "It is but like children's games, when all is done in jest; and which wise men count not worthy their observance. It is but like the acting of a comedy, when great persons and actions are personated and counterfeited; and a pompous stir there is for a while to please the foolish spectators, that themselves may be pleased by their applause; and then they come down, and their sport is ended, and they are as they were. It is but like a puppet play, where there is great doings to little purpose, or like the busy gadding of the laborious ants, to gather together a little heap of sticks and straw, which the spurn of man's foot will soon disperse." When by faith we forecast the scenes of the world to come, and let the mind fill itself with the contemplation of what and where we shall be, one hundred years hence, we see great truth and force in such a description.

The *emptiness* of this world is thus set forth by the same hand—"What! shall we prefer a mole-hill before a kingdom, a shadow before the substance, an hour before eternity, nothing before all things, vanity and vexation before felicity? The cross of Christ hath set up such a sun, that quite darkeneth the light of worldly glory. Though earth were something if there were no better to be had, it is nothing when heaven standeth by." If we could live and breathe amid such conceptions of time and eternity, as seemed to be so familiar to the mind of Baxter—if we could make them our habitual thoughts, and form our lives upon them, we should have made one of the most valuable of all attainments. It is a great thing to discourse so powerfully of time and eternity, but greater to conform the life to the discourse.—*Puritan.*

Daniel and his Enemies.

What a striking contrast between Daniel and his enemies! The latter were unprincipled and unfeeling; there was about them a lurking baseness of character, the predominance of the sordid and selfish, without one particle of generosity or loftiness of sentiment; and, provided their own malevolent and ambitious ends were accomplished, there was no attempt, however desperate, no act, however atrocious, from which they would have shrunk. Professing to be fit for ruling one of the mightiest nations then in existence, by plotting the overthrow and procuring a death-warrant against the most virtuous, the most unimpeachable, the wisest, and most useful man in the empire, because he stood in their way as a rival, and outshone them in wisdom, popularity and power, a man whose virtues they were compelled to venerate and acknowledge, at the very time they were laying snares for his life—they discovered the worst passions of depraved humanity, and gave a clear proof that they were unqualified for the high station to which they were raised. Daniel, on the

other hand, is calm and resolute; no unholy passions agitate his soul; truth and duty were his guides, and in following them, it mattered not to him what earthly sufferings he might endure. How few are willing to sacrifice worldly honour, and fewer still to sacrifice life for the cause of God! Daniel was willing to sacrifice both. In braving the terrors of the lion's den, he appeared greater than as prime minister of the court of Darius, and exhibited a moral heroism which is seldom to be found in the courts of kings. When forsaken and cast off by men, his indomitable spirit, neither dispirited nor overwhelmed, bravely bade defiance to every peril, reposing an unfaltering trust in his God. That trust was not in vain, for it "stopped the mouths of lions," as the faith of his brethren before had "quenched the violence of the fire." But, though delivered, Daniel was a martyr in purpose, and deserves to occupy a place in the martyrology of the Church, a record that should be known and read, as a wonder and example to all.—*From Sermons by the Rev. J. Anderson.*

Slavery—How it Works.

Comparing Virginia with New York from 1790 to 1830, a period of forty years, Virginia has lost in population nearly a million of inhabitants! Virginia has increased in a ratio of only *sixteen per cent.*, while the ratio of New York for the same period is not less than *five hundred and sixty per cent.*! The total amount of property in Virginia, including about half a million of slaves at their market value, is much less than one half of the property of New York, without attaching any value to the labourers who cultivate the soil. The real and personal property of Virginia ought to be some six or eight hundred millions of dollars greater than it is, to make equal progress in accumulation with New York. In 1790, the population of Virginia was more than double the population of New York; in 1841, the tables are nearly turned in this respect. The territory of New York is about 40,000 square miles; the territory of Virginia about 60,000; and in position, climate, soil, and navigable rivers, Virginia has decided advantages over her towering and victorious rival. We have observed sales of immense tracts of land in different parts of Virginia during the past season, at prices nearly nominal—a few cents per acre; less indeed than would be offered for lands on the sides of the broken mountains and barren hills of New Hampshire.

What a glorious State would Virginia be, with her immense territory, enough for a kingdom, her noble rivers, her bland climate, her naturally rich soil, and her high-minded and chivalrous free population, were it not for the canker of slavery, which blights all, curses all! For the sake of the master as well as for the slave—for the sake of the nation as well as for the State, may every yoke speedily be broken, and the children of oppression be set free.—*Journal Com.*

A modern author, speaking of anonymous letter-writing, says that an anonymous letter is a mode of moral murder, which using only a pen for a poniard and an inkstand for a bowl, poisons confidence and stabs character without fear of detection.

Church Reform in Scotland.

The reforming movement in our Church has by this time gathered, to speak nautically, so much *way*, that no such thing as suppressing it is now possible. One way or another, established or severed from the State, the Church will make good the principles she is contending for. The sooner, therefore, that her enemies cease from the imagination that she will anon settle quietly down upon the old resting-place whence she has just risen to shake herself clear from the defilements contracted in a century of jobbing neglect, the sooner may they obtain the credit of a little discernment. But are the Church reforms of the nineteenth century to be confined to Scotland alone? We, for our part, think the spirit of them somewhat contagious. We venture to believe that if the agitation of ecclesiastical questions shall continue to engross the public mind for a few years more on this side the border, it is not altogether improbable that our neighbours on the other side will by and by inquire, with something like general curiosity, what is disturbing us; and that when they have taken pains to hear what are the abuses we complain of, they may begin to help out their own conceptions of them by illustrations taken from among themselves. The settlement of our difficulties cannot, it is true, be adjourned for a lengthened period without serious consequences to our establishment, but neither can it be long delayed without some danger to the quiet of prelate dignities. When the fire gets high, there will be risk of sparks. Therefore we conceive there may be more than one reason urging legislators, not anxious to have their hands over full of ecclesiastical complications, to a speedy adjustment of our dispute.

Even already, the demand, all unheard of till now, that the election of pastors in the English Church shall be placed on a popular basis, has been mooted in the Church's own bosom. We have before us a tract (of which six thousand copies have been sold) by an English Episcopal clergyman, in which the expediency of popular election is boldly urged. The author, the Rev. Mr. Spencer, is evidently a man accustomed to original and independent thinking, and one who, to an ardent and fearless temper, joins talents and accomplishments both of a high order. His numerous former tracts have all been in extraordinary request. His "*Practical Suggestions on Church Reform*," now before us, are the result of the fearless scrutiny with which he has surveyed the constitution and practice of his Church. The suggestions which he makes for reviving her efficiency are four. Of these, one relates to the mere temporalities, another is a proposal to supply the larger towns with a rotation of preachers somewhat after the Wesleyan fashion, and a third is for the revisal of the liturgy and articles, and for allowing greater liberty to the clergy in the performance of divine service. But his grand idea is, "*to give to the parishioners of every parish the right to appoint their own ministers.*" He supports this proposal by a very good summary of anti-patronage arguments. It is impossible, he thinks, for the people to choose from worse motives than those by which the present patrons are often actuated. He asks if the members of a congregation are less competent to decide for themselves than the nobility and gentry to decide for them. "Is it to be supposed," he demands, "that the great ones of the earth are

now become the only judges of Christian doctrine and Christian preaching, and that the rest are to be despised as unfit to be consulted in these matters?" In the practical success of the system of popular choice he is quite confident. The common people, he is satisfied, would every where hear the sound word gladly, and prudently provide themselves with fitting ministers of it.—*Edinburgh Witness.*

The Literature of Popery.

Before the Reformation the superior clergy themselves were sunk in great ignorance. A bishop of Dunfeldt congratulated himself on having learned Greek or Hebrew. The monks asserted that all heresies arose from these languages, but especially from the Greek. "The New Testament," said one of them, "is a book full of serpents and thorns. Greek," continued he, "is a modern language, but recently invented, and against which we must be upon our guard. As to Hebrew, my dear brethren, it is certain that whoever studies *that* immediately becomes a Jew." Heresbach, a friend of Erasmus, and a respectable writer, reports these very words. Thomas Linacer, a learned and celebrated divine, had never read the New Testament. Drawing near his end (in 1524) he called for it, but quickly threw it from him with an oath, because his eye had caught the words, "But I say unto you, Swear not at all." "Either this is not the Gospel," said he, "or we are not Christians." Even the school of theology in Paris did not scruple to declare before the Parliament, "There is an end of religion if the study of Hebrew and Greek is permitted."

If here and there among the clergy some learning existed, it was not in sacred literature. The Ciceronians of Italy affected a great contempt for the Bible on account of its style: men who arrogated to themselves the title of Priests of Christ's Church, translated the words of the Holy Ghost into the style of Virgil and of Horace, to accommodate them to the ears of men of taste. The Cardinal Bembo wrote always, instead of the *Holy Spirit*, "the breath of the celestial zephyr;" for *remission of sins*, he substituted the "pity of the Manes and of the gods; and instead of *Christ the Son of God*, "Minerva sprung from the brows of Jupiter." Finding one day the respectable Sadoletus employed on a translation of the Epistle to the Romans, "Leave these childish productions," said he, "such puerilities do not become a sensible man."—*Merle D'Aubigne.*

The Fathers.—If you demand for the writers of the earliest ages of the church peculiar honour or authority, establish their title to such a rank. Produce, if they exist, better writings from the pens of the fathers, than we can adduce from the Reformers, and those who followed them. Who, among the primitive churches, ever gave us such a commentary as that of Luther on the Galatians, or Jewell on the Thessalonians, or Leighton on Peter? Show us the books, from the authors of the first centuries, which will compete with the Pilgrim's Progress, or the Saint's Everlasting Rest. If you can do this, you will indeed have done something.—*Christian Guardian.*

Remarkable Movement among the Druzes.

A Druze community of about 100,000 souls has formally resolved to embrace Protestant Christianity, and has requested the American mission at Beyroot to take charge of their spiritual interests, and supply them with teachers. They wish for schools and missionary labours in all their villages. This is probably the most important opening for missionary labour which Divine Providence ever presented to the Board; not even excepting the Sandwich Islands, the Nestorians or the Armenians. The Druzes have hitherto been regarded as a sect of Mohammedans. The first convert among them joined the mission church at the hazard of martyrdom, and was imprisoned, with a view to putting him to death for apostacy from the Moslem faith. The present movement secures access to the whole Druze nation; and the more numerous Ansarea, whose religious and civil condition has been much like theirs, must follow the example. Practically, all Syria is laid open, and a breach is made in the wall of Mohammedan despotism, through which Christian teachers may pass and repass with their converts. By particular request of the Druze chiefs, a high school, for the instruction of their young nobility has been opened at their capital, which is Der el Kamer, about twenty miles, nearly southeast from Beyrout. Messrs. Van Dyck and Wolcott have taken charge of it. Mr. Smith, on arriving from Smyrna, which he left the day after his arrival, did not stop even to open his house at Beyrout, but went at once to the mountains, to labour among the Druzes.

The Influence of the Bar.—At a recent examination of candidates for reception into the church, it was stated by one of the candidates that his first thorough conversion to Christianity, and to a sense of the condemned state of the sinner, was produced by listening to an argument of David Paul Brown, upon the trial of a case of murder, in which the question as to the competency of an infidel to testify, was discussed.—*U. S. Gaz.*

Church of Scotland.

We subjoin various notices from recent foreign papers relating to the present state of the question in the Scotch Church. A distinguished member of the British Government had declared, "that it was the intention of the government to which he had the honour to belong, to prepare and bring forward, not a partial or instalment measure, as the Duke of Argyle's bill was characterized by many of the members of the General Assembly who advocated that measure, but such a measure as would ensure a satisfactory, full, and final settlement of this long-protracted, and painful question, and place the Church of Scotland upon a sure and lasting foundation, securing to it all its undoubted rights and privileges, and that nothing should be wanting or left undone by him as an individual, or as a member of the government, in aiding and assisting, promoting, and carrying through such a measure, and which, he hoped, would be accomplished to the satisfaction of every reasonable person in the country."

Synod of Angus and Mearns.—This Synod met at Brechin on Tuesday last. The following overture anent the present position of the Church was proposed by Mr. Clugston of Forfar, and carried by a majority of *twenty-seven to eight*.

“Whereas certain office-bearers of the Church have declared it to be their intention to make application to the Legislature to have themselves and those who adhere to them, recognised as the established Church of the country, to the exclusion of those who maintain the principles which have been declared and acted on in recent General Assemblies of the Church, it is humbly overtured to the Synod that they adopt the following resolutions declaratory of their principles on the subject at present controverted:—

“1st. That they adhere steadfastly to the principles that no pastor is to be intruded into any parish contrary to the will of the congregation; and that the Lord Jesus Christ has established a government in the hands of Church officers distinct from the civil Magistrate, and exclusive of his authority in all spiritual matters.

“2d. That these principles are the inalienable privileges of the established Church of Scotland, and are set forth in her Books of Discipline and Confession of Faith, ratified by law.

“3d. That the assumption by the civil Courts of a right to compel ordination to the ministerial office and admission to a pastoral charge—to interdict and prohibit the preaching of the gospel and the dispensing of ordinances—to revise the sentences of Church Courts, and remove spiritual censures imposed by them in the exercise of discipline—are not only contrary to the constitution of this country, but utterly subversive of the order which Christ has instituted, and the authority which he challenges as King in his Church.

“4th. That the declaration emitted by certain office-bearers of the Church, that they ‘regard it as binding upon every member of the Church, as established by law, to be subject to the civil power in all matters adjudged by the supreme civil authorities of the country to affect temporal rights, and that for conscience sake,’ would, if acted on, annihilate the jurisdiction of the Church Courts, acknowledge an obligation inconsistent with the Word of God and the Confession of Faith, and should be publicly disowned by this Synod.”

Synod of Aberdeen.—At a meeting of the Synod of Aberdeen, last week, Mr. Low, of Keig, supported by Mr. Robertson, of Ellon, moved an overture to the General Assembly to repeal the Veto Act. The motion was met by a resolution moved by Dr. Brown, of Marischal College, expressing the regret of the Synod at the opposition which some members of the Court had offered to the General Assembly, and at their having held ministerial communion with the deposed ministers of Strathbogie, and overturing the General Assembly, “at all hazards to maintain inviolate the supremacy of the Divine head of the Church as set forth in the doctrine of the spiritual independence of the Church and the rights and privileges of the Christian people of her communion.” The latter was carried by sixty-four votes to thirty-six.

Synod of Galloway.—This Synod met at Newton-Stewart on Tuesday the 26th October, the Synod proceeded to discuss the following overture—“That this Synod adheres to the resolutions passed

at the great meeting held in the West Kirk, Edinburgh, on the 25th August—that it is determined to maintain, at all hazards, the two grand principles for which the Church of Scotland is now contending—viz. the principle of non-intrusion and the headship of the Messiah—and urges upon its members the propriety of instituting Church Defence Associations throughout the district, and of using every means that may be deemed expedient for enlightening the public mind in regard to the present crisis of the Church.” After a good deal of desultory discussion, in which the Moderates manifested no small alarm at the formation of Church Defence Associations, the first motion was carried by a majority of nine to four.

From the Scottish Guardian.

Every one who has had his eye on the progress of the controversy must be well aware that it is only through the vigorous movements of the Church and the country, that public men have been brought to look seriously at the subject at all. And nothing would more certainly blight the bud of promise which has recently begun to open, than the appearance of apathy in Scotland. The Church and her great cause have enemies, who make it their business to misrepresent in London—who have been doing so all along—the state of feeling which prevails upon the question. It is easy to foresee what use such persons would make of a cessation from those measures which are now in progress to call forth from the parishes in Scotland such indications of their views and feelings as the emergency requires. Some, indeed, have a shrinking timidity lest public meetings, and other similar means of giving expression to the public mind, should offend the Government, and indispose them to grant such a settlement as we desire. This fear is founded on a very gross mistake. Unquestionably it would be very wrong at such meetings to indulge in violent recriminations against the Moderate party in the Church, or in any expression disrespectful to her Majesty's Government. As for the Moderate party, they, or at least their chief leaders, have taken a step which it is a great duty to explain and to expose to the whole Scottish people. The friends of the Church will commit a blunder of the first magnitude if they do not place the alternative, which Dr. Cook intimated his purpose to put to the British Parliament, in all its offensiveness, before every parish of this country. The gross Erastianism of the principles he and his adherents avowed it to be their intention to ask Parliament to set up in the Church of Scotland, must be unveiled to the eyes of the whole people—that they may be in a condition to protect themselves against so monstrous an invasion, or rather so total and shameful a surrender, of the grand doctrine of the Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ. But even in doing this most necessary and important duty, there is no need for bitterness of speech; nor would there be any justice in assuming that the whole Moderate party is prepared to homologate Dr. Cook's proceedings. From information we have received, we think there is the best reason to believe that many members of that party repudiate his Erastianism, and the rash and violent proposal in which it is embodied, with their whole hearts. It is due to such men, therefore, in speaking on the subject, not to make sweeping and indiscriminate charges, but rather to assume the tone which is due to their real convictions, and which is far the most likely to bring about harmony and peace.

From the Northern Times, Conservative, Sunderland.

The factious minority of irreligious *Moderates*, sadly miscalculating the support they were likely to have from a Tory government, have been induced to speak out, and let their real principles and true character be known. The consequences are, not merely that the indignation of Presbyterian Scotland is being roused against them, and that greater numbers there are uniting more decidedly in support of the reforming majority of Evangelical men, but also that, even in England, the question is becoming better understood; that the Erastianism of the *Moderates* is seen to be destructive of all that is worth preserving in the Church; that the Evangelical majority, so far from breaking the existing law in resisting the most flagrant encroachments of the Court of Session, are found to be the true Conservatives; and that a conviction is gaining ground among all classes, that, were a decision pronounced in favour of the minority, and sanctioning the doctrines of the Court of Session, a blow would be struck perfectly ruinous to *all* Christian Establishments, and a principle acknowledged utterly inconsistent with religious liberty even in dissenting communities. In these circumstances, the religious Conservatives of England are beginning to see more clearly which side of the question belongs to them.

From the London Patriot.

Mr. Candlish is reported to have made this declaration at Perth—"Let it be clearly understood---let there be no misapprehension on the point---that the Church will accept of no settlement that touches in the slightest degree the sacredness of her discipline in the matter of the Strathbogie ministers. If the Legislature offer us the very best measure, even the abolition of patronage with one hand, and with the other require us to restore these men to the ministry, we will reject the boon, so clogged, with scorn, as foully dishonouring to Him from whom we derive infinitely more than the State can give us. The Church has perilled all her honour, her integrity, upon that act of discipline; and if she consent to any compromise, the sooner she ceases to be an establishment the better."

From the Edinburgh Witness.

We took occasion in a recent number to contradict one of the various reports now in circulation relative to the Church question---reports, we fear, industriously circulated by the Church's enemies. We have now to notice another of these, which has reference to the late Strathbogie ministers. Some will have it that they are to be summarily reponed---their restoration being made the condition of a settlement of the non-intrusion question. On the other hand, it is contended, that their restoration on any terms having been made impossible by declarations in non-intrusion speeches, no settlement of the general question can ever be looked for. A few words of explanation on this point may be seasonable.

This question of discipline will never, we trust, be mixed up with the general question of the Church's affairs. It is a question purely of *discipline*, and never can be made the subject of *negotiation* or *treaty*. It will be most unwise in any party to insist on this. It is impossible for the Church to admit of it. Let the question of non-intrusion be entertained, canvassed, and settled on its own proper merits; for it is not to be determined by its bearing on the interests of seven individuals, but by its influence on the welfare of the Christian people of Scotland.

In thus noticing another of the rumours now so rife, we desire again most urgently to renew our caution against the friends of the Church giving any heed to them, or relaxing their efforts in consequence of them. We say advisedly, that there is as little certain prospect of a satisfactory settlement of the question at the present moment as there has

been since the contest commenced: and nothing, humanly speaking, will secure such a settlement, but the vigorous prosecution of the system of organization now in progress, and the assumption of such a position by the office-bearers and members of the Church, throughout the whole kingdom, as will at last convince their opponents of what there is such extreme reluctance to believe, that they are thoroughly in earnest, and resolved to submit to years of hardship and struggles rather than abandon their principles and betray the spiritual privileges of the Christian people.

Scotch Degrees.

WHEN the University of St. Andrew's sold her honours, a certain minister, who deemed that his ministrations would be more acceptable and more useful if he possessed what the Germans call the doctor-hat, put £15 in his purse, and went to St. Andrew's "to purchase for himself a good degree." His man-servant accompanied him, and was present when his master was formally admitted to the long desired honour. On his return "the doctor" sent for his servant, and addressed him somewhat as follows: "Noo Saunders, ye'll aye be sure to ca' me *the doctor*; and gin onybody spiers at you aboot me, ye'll be aye sure to say the doctor's in his study, or the doctor's engaged, or the doctor will see you in a crack." "That a' depends," was the reply, "whether ye ca' me the doctor too." The Rev. doctor started. "Ay, it's just so," continued the other; "for when I fand that it cost sae little, I e'en got a diploma myself. Sae ye'll just be good enough to say, 'Doctor, put on some coals, or doctor, bring the whisky and hot water, and gin onybody spiers at ye aboot me, ye'll be aye sure to say the doctor's in the stable, or the doctor's in the pantry, or the doctor's digging potatoes, as the case may be.'"

The Lynching Case at Oberlin.—It will be remembered by our readers that we stated some time ago, that the individuals engaged in the disgraceful lynching case at Oberlin, in the summer of 1840, were to be prosecuted for that outrage. In the Court of Common Pleas for Lorain county, Ohio, as we learn from the Ohio Atlas, that case came up at the last session. *Civil* and *criminal* suits were brought against five individuals concerned. In the former the jury gave *fifteen hundred dollars* damages to the young man. In the latter, the Court decreed a fine of *fifty dollars* on one of the individuals, and *one hundred dollars* on each of the others.

Episcopacy in Scotland.—The Glasgow Courier says that "during the last few years Episcopacy has made rapid advances in Scotland, and that in a meeting held at Edinburgh, in August last, it was agreed to erect a college at Perth, for the purpose of educating students of theology, and the sons of the gentry of Scotland of the Episcopal persuasion. The persons who have been most active on this occasion are Mr. Gladstone, M. P. for Newark, the Rev. Mr. E. Ramsay, and Mr. Hope, of Rankeilour. This institution will, no doubt, to a certain extent, affect the interests of the Scottish Universities, as well as serve to promote those of Episcopacy."

will
of
by
ole
uch
and
don
ple.

ain
ota-
oc-
ur-
ied
the
ser-
e'll
oot
loc-
de-
The
for
Sae
, or
s at
the
case

our
aged
840,
mon
that
were
jury
the
indi-

dur-
Scot-
t was
g stu-
f the
ve on
r. E.
ll, no
iver-

CONTENTS.

	Page		Page
On the Insuperableness of the Word	325	Human Life pointed to the Life,	325
in Regeneration,	325	Daniel and his Enemies,	326
The Divisions and Present State of	326	Slavery—how it works,	326
the Associate Church,	326	Church Reform in Scotland,	329
General Assembly of the Presbyte-	329	The Literature of Popery,	331
rian Church in Ireland,	329	The Fathers,	331
Causes of God and Truth,	332	Movement among the Drama,	332
Presbytery of Philadelphia,	335	The Influence of the Bar,	332
Obituary,	335	Church of Scotland,	332
Controversy,	336	Synod of Aberdeen,	333
Bunyan's Predication of the Co-	337	Synod of Galloway,	333
rd Theology,	337	Scotch Degrees,	336
Persecution of the Christians in Tur-	337	The Lynching Case at Obolton,	336
key,	337	Episcopacy in Scotland,	336

☆ **NOTICE.**—Subscribers who have received defective Numbers for November, by the transposition or omission of pages in folding, will please return them, that their place may be supplied by correct copies of said No.

WM. S. YOUNG, ITS Race Street, Philada.

AGENTS.—In addition to the ministers and itinerating preachers of good standing in the Associate Church, who are requested to receive subscriptions and money, and give receipts, the following persons are authorized to act as special agents:

J. B. Waddie, 31 Market Street, Pitts-	Thomas Cummings, Paterson, Washing-
burgh, Pa.	ton Co., N. Y.
James Henry, Albany, N. Y.	James Wilson, Esq., Forks of Muddy
Four M'Arthur, Cambridge, Washing-	Creek, York Co., Pa.
ton County, N. Y.	Alexander W. Brewster, Erie, Pa.
Alex. Gailley, Clark's Ferry, Perry Co. Pa.	James Hutchinson, Esq., New London
Wm. McMillan, Potter's Mills, Oshre-	Cross Roads, Chester Co., Pa.
Co., Pa.	John Smith, Pittsburgh Village, Carroll
Thomas Beveridge, v. s., Camerburgh,	Co., Indiana.
Pa.	E. G. Shannon, P. M., Columbus, Kan-
James Gordon, Poets, Livingston Co.,	dolph Co., Ill.
N. Y.	Col. Wm. McVay, Cherry Forks, Adams
John Anderson, Huntington, Pa.	Co., Ohio.

TERMS.—Two Dollars per annum, payable in advance or at the annual meeting of the Associate Synod.

Post Masters are respectfully requested to notify us of any discontinuance of the work sent to their office. The numbers need not be returned.

No subscription discontinued till arrears are paid, unless at the option of the proprietors.

Money may be sent by mail at the risk and expense of the proprietors when five dollars or more is enclosed, provided the money is at par value in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, New York, or Albany.

David Christy, the General Agent of the Calvinistic Board Concern, expects to visit the congregations of the Associate Church, in connexion with the other denominations interested, to make arrangements for the supply of the publications of the Board, and has also proposed to aid in extending the circulation of the *Monitor*. He is an authorized agent for the *Monitor*, and his visit will afford the opportunity to many of furnishing themselves with our periodical.

PROPOSALS for publishing the last part of Dr. Gill's *History of the Church*, which is perfect in itself and was originally published in a separate volume: together with an *Introductory Essay*, explanatory of the *General Offer*, by C. Wasserman. Although Dr. Gill's *Refutation of Arianism* is entirely satisfactory, yet his views of the *General Offer* are very erroneous. To correct this defect in the work is the design of the *Introductory Essay*. One thousand copies will be printed. Persons sending in their orders in season will have the work delivered to them at Albany, Pittsburgh, and Xenia, Ohio, at the next meeting of Synod. The work, neatly bound in muslin, can be supplied at fifty cents a copy, or twelve copies for \$5 00, or sent to Subscribers in cash money as they may direct, or in pamphlet form without covers, at thirty-seven and a-half cents a copy, or seventeen copies for \$5 00.